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ABSTRACT

The following analysis is based on a case study of three years' duration (1983-1986), and focuses on a physical education department at a large English comprehensive school which became involved in a teacher initiated curriculum innovation when a new Head of Department was appointed in September 1983. The research process was guided by the grounded theory approach, and the use of prolonged observation coupled with reflexive interviews allowed the emergent concerns of the teachers in relation to the innovation to be made evident, as competing definitions of both subject paradigm and pedagogy clashed. Within the department, several micropolitical strategies were constructed to cope with the pressures of change, which legitimised a dislocation between the 'classroom' and 'educational' contexts of the school, allowing some of the teachers to deflect the implications of the innovation for their own practice. It is suggested that the strategies employed by teachers arise within the social context of the school as a work place that provides, dilemmas, opportunities and possibilities within which the teacher constructs, modifies and abandons coping strategies to enhance both long and short term self interests.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE BRAINSTOWN STUDY
1.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE BRANSTOWN STUDY

The following micro-sociologically orientated case study, focuses upon the effects of a teacher initiated curriculum innovation on the lives of seven physical education teachers, from September 1983 to September 1986, at a large English co-educational comprehensive school called Branstown. The innovations were created and instigated by Alex, the newly appointed Head of Department who came to the school in April 1983, and consisted of the following structural changes to the prevailing curriculum; firstly the abolition of streaming in games lessons and the introduction of mixed-ability teaching in these sessions, and secondly the utilisation of physical education specialists only for teaching the subject in years one to three. Such changes may appear trite and commonplace to the reader, but to those within the department at Branstown School, including, Monica (Head of Girls, scale 2), Catherine, Simon, Peter, and Jeremy (all scale 1), and Rachel (a probationer), the changes proposed by Alex were to greatly affect their working lives and future careers, it was important to them, and it remains important to them. The overall aim of the study is, then, to examine the process of change at the departmental level in this school by placing an emphasis on the emergent nature of social interaction, as processes were experienced and coped with by the physical educators involved.

These innovations should not be considered as objective structural entities that can be understood aside, and separate from, the different
meanings and significances it had for the physical educators involved. As will be made clear in the following chapters, the meanings attached to 'mixed-ability', and 'specialists in the lower years', should not be taken as given and based on a shared understanding, but rather as terms covering different kinds of possible orientation and forms of relationships, that remain to be defined by the experiences and practices of those involved in it. Innovation in terms of the Branstown Study is, therefore, taken to be a cultural phenomenon, as defined by Esland (1972);

"Essentially, the term 'innovation' refers to an idea or practice which is perceived by a group of people to be a significant departure from existing practice. Moreover it is a social process. It takes place through time and is part of the social reality of a community of people. Although the innovative idea is in individual consciousness, it nevertheless remains a product of social interaction. Furthermore, it can only be sustained through social interaction." (Esland, 1972, p. 103)

Hence, this study is concerned with innovation as an interaction process, and philosophically and methodologically its orientation is naturalistic-interpretive, revolving around the question of, What is going on here?, which itself leads to a rejection of prescription in favour of analysis. The Branstown Study seeks in part to describe and understand the change process within the social institution of the school in terms of the actors' interpretations of events, but analytically, the study confronts the task of placing teacher perceptions, and interactions with each other plus pupils, in a wider social context that does not rest solely (but relies heavily) upon the interpretation of teachers actions and utterences. Much of the analysis is in the form of second order constructs and categories
which inevitably rigidifies, simplifies, and reifies the actual interpretations, perspectives and meanings held by the physical educators. The reality of a social institution as large as a school, or even one department within it, is far too complex and multi-faceted to be susceptible to complete or totally adequate representation through what Ball (1981a) calls the "relatively crude and inexact conceptual mechanisms of sociology" (p.xviii). What is offered in the following chapters can only be a mere approximation of reality, a 'snapshot' of a department in the process of change, an account derived from the experiences of a single researcher, with all the problems of selection and interpretation that this entails.

It is important to realise that the innovations conceived within the physical education department at Branstown School are still having their effects on those who work there, and on those who have left the school to teach elsewhere. This study is, however, predominantly concerned with the pre-implementation or adoption phase of the innovation during the academic year 1983-1984, since it was during this period that the intensive field work in the school was completed whilst the author was unemployed. During this year an average of two days per week was spent with the department, the rest of the time being consumed by efforts to earn some form of income by occasional supply teaching, supplemented by various forms of 'moonshining' employment, such as, nightclub 'bouncer', barman, and road laying. Fortunately, in September 1984 the author gained lawful employment in the form of a three year contract to cover a seconded lecturer at Loughborough University, which enabled him to extend the study via
interviews until September 1986. This continuation, however, retained as its focus the events of the year 1983-1984, and new data and evidence was used to deepen the understanding and interpretations made by the author of that period.

It is also important to realise that despite all the efforts of the author, little justice can be done to the complexities contained within the world of the physical educators at Branstown School. Great thanks is extended to them for allowing the author into their world, for being so honest, and for allowing him to write about a sensitive period in their lives. Since they remain in their world the author has a responsibility to protect them, hence, all the names in this study are pseudonyms and after negotiations with the teachers involved a three year moratorium has been placed on this thesis.

(1.2) AN OUTLINE OF CONTENTS.

The influences on the Branstown Study have been wide ranging, and the author has been eclectic in his use of theoretical ideas to interpret the events within the school and department, which he attempts to articulate in the following chapters. Chapter 2, provides an overview of recent trends in research on innovation and social change, and several 'gaps' are identified in the educational literature in relation to studies which adopt a humanistic conception of man. The implications of holding such a conception of man, along with choosing to conduct research within the essentially anti-foundational naturalistic paradigm is addressed in Chapter 3. Here, the tensions,
anxieties, and confusions of the author concerning the nature and adequacy of researcher interpretations of social events are made evident, and a plea is made to consider the research process in a wholistic fashion by linking philosophical and technical issues in order to create process resonance. This, however, is not a release from relativism, and certain tensions remained unresolved at the end of the study which will require further consideration in the future.

The methodologies of the study are discussed in Chapters 4-7. Several problems involved in using case study as a research strategy, such as, generalisation, and defining the boundaries of a case, are considered in Chapter 4, whilst in Chapters 5 and 6 the two main data gathering techniques of interviewing and observation are dealt with. Despite allocating them to separate chapters for convenience, an attempt is made to indicate how the use of reflexive interviews was informed by, and themselves informed the researcher-participant form of observation adopted, in a cyclic and symbiotic relationship. Both observation and interviews were guided by the grounded theory approach, and Chapter 7 outlines the suitability of this approach to the conditions that prevailed at Branstown School. Several tensions inherent in the notion of grounded theory are considered, and the author's interpretation of this approach as generative, localised and patterned, is made explicit in order to substantiate his use of the key components of theoretical sampling, and category generation along with its extension via cognitive mapping.
The events within the physical education department at Branstown School begin to be considered in Chapter 8, which provides a brief history of the department along with details of the teachers present in September 1983, in order to contextualise the arrival of Alex which is discussed in Chapter 9. Here, the emergent nature of the innovations, both for Alex and his staff are made evident, as competing perspectives on subject pedagogy and paradigm are brought to bear on the implications of curriculum change for each member of the department.

The core categories to arise from the grounded analysis are considered in Chapters 10-13, in the form of a web of 'teacher concerns' in relation to the proposed innovations. Commitment to both schooling and the change process as understood by the physical educators is discussed in Chapter 10, whilst Chapter 11 considers the hidden pedagogy of control and its relationship to teacher and pupil achievement, both of which were essential in the construction of the self as 'good' teacher. Linked to these, and discussed in Chapter 12, is the notion of teacher autonomy and the cloaking effect the closed classroom can have on the educational 'realities' of the classroom, and on teacher competence in both its technical, and procedural forms. The final, but extremely influential concern to be considered in Chapter 13 is that of status, which continued to have a pervasive affect upon the thinking of the physical educators with regards to the innovations throughout the study, and their feelings of marginality provided a framework in which the innovative idea was utilised from its inception as a means to enhance both personal and subject status.
The emergent concerns in relation to the innovations clearly indicates the hopes, fears, confusions, and aspirations of the physical educators as they attempted to interpret, and cope with their own positions in the change process as it affected them personally in their daily working lives. Resistance, distrust, and conflict are underlying themes in the preceding chapters but becomes central to Chapters 14, 15, and 16, which focus on the constructed micropolitical solutions to the problems of change for those involved, as the physical educators attempted to maximise their self interests within the school. The institutional pressures on Alex to produce change are considered in Chapter 14, which also deals with his use of various forms of power in an attempt to dominate the realities of those within his department, who for their part utilise the resources at their disposal to create resistance to, and deflect pressures from, their Head of Department.

Attempts to reprofessionalise the subject by Alex which gained the strong support of the women and the energetic resistance of several of the men, is considered in Chapter 15, whilst Chapter 16 deals with the emergent pragmatic strategy of rhetoric which was developed during the course of the study by the physical educators to cope with the pressures and demands of calls for innovation in the context of the school as a work place. This strategic rhetoric enabled self interests to be maximised, whilst allowing conflicts to be deflected, as teacher autonomy remained intact and the implications of change were 'frozen' within the educational context of the school, thereby, necessitating little if any change in the practice of teaching in the classroom.
Chapter 17 draws the study to a close and contains a reflective view of the research endeavour at Branstown School, with speculations for the direction of future research efforts in relation to educational change.
CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL CHANGE
The literature on innovation is extensive. Havelock (1969) identified 4000 studies and estimated that approximately 1000 more were being carried out each year (this was certainly an under-estimate because few European studies were included), Kelly and Kranzberg (1978) reviewed more than 4000 items in the literature on technological innovation alone, and Boyan (1986) indicates there is no decrease in the pace of studies on innovation. However, as Chin and Downey (1973) make clear, these studies come from a wide range of disciplines and are influenced by diverse research traditions, leading to the emergence of a bewildering variety of models and theories along with frequent terminological and conceptual overlaps, resulting in a state of confusion for any individual attempting to gain an overall grasp of the area.

To assist in clarification Bolam (1978) attempted to provide an organising framework for the wider literature as it relates to educational innovation, proposing that in any innovation process four factors can be distinguished, (a) the change agent, (b) the innovation, (c) the user system, and (d) the process or innovation over time. By treating the user as a social system', and using the same approach with the change agent and the innovation, he attempted to explore the systematic implications and consequences of an innovation as the three factors interact with change, and are changed by each other during the innovation over time. Bennis et
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al(1969) produced an overview of strategies which have been used in innovations and identified three groups, (a) empirical-rational, (b) normative-re-educative, and (c) power-coercive. Likewise, Paulston's(1976) review of models and theories of social and educational change identifies two groups of theories, (a) equilibrium - these relate to rational-empirical and normative re-educative approaches which covers a range of functional theories, and (b) conflict - which often involves power-coercive strategies for change. Dalin(1978) identifies three groups or categories of theories, (a) functional - which are evolutionary in nature based upon theoretical sociology involving multi-linear theories of social evolution, (b) eclectic - theories based on the premise that change in social systems is a product of human personality, and (c) conflict - based upon neo-marxist approaches. He concludes with a warning as to the dangers of over simplifying and polarising such descriptions since in reality competing theories and strategies intermingle in their form of operation.

Such attempts at model building have been common in the innovation literature and have not been without influence, yet as Bolam(1978) realises any model of this kind is bound to be oversimplified, and in contrast several writers have attempted a time-perspectives analysis. In terms of implementing innovations, Fullan(1986) claims that the past fifteen years and the immediate future may be conceived of in three phases. The first phase, covering most of the 1970s, was essentially that of documenting failure. The second phase, approximately 1978 to the present, the identification and
analysis of success and effectiveness in schools became the dominant theme, whilst the third and present phase just being embarked upon is the managing of change.

In like fashion House (1979) traces the emergence of the 'technological perspective' in the 1960's personified by the research-development-diffusion approach as conceptualised by Clarke and Guba (1965) and developed rigorously by Havelock (1969,1971). House in 1974 with his publication 'The Politics of Educational Innovation', initiated the 'political perspective' which gained momentum in Britain with the work of MacDonald and Walker (1976). This perspective was essentially macro orientated, viewing educational innovation within the broader perspective of social change, hence Becher and Maclure (1978) tie innovation in schools to the larger national framework, and Kogan (1978) relates educational change to changes in the total political and administrative system. This perspective still flourishes as is indicated by the works of Hunter (1985), Hoyle (1986a,1986b), and Gronn (1986). Interestingly despite Hoyles's (1982) call for a focus on the micropolitics of change in schools, his most recent book on the subject in 1986 'The Politics of School Management' is unable to add much to his earlier views for lack of empirical studies at the micro level, with Ball's (1985) analysis of becoming a comprehensive school providing an exploratory venture into the micro-meso level.

In the 1970's came the emergence of the 'cultural perspective' initiated by Goodland (1975), Saranson (1971), and Smith and
Kieth (1971), who adopted a distinctly socio-anthropological stance to the study of educational innovation. This anthropological intent is most clearly evidenced in Wolcott's (1977) 'Teachers Versus Technocrats', in which he focused not on the change itself, but on the different meanings produced by the efforts of a group of administrators and developers to impose innovation on a group of teachers. This subjective concern for the meaning of school life gained momentum in Britain with the work of Lacey (1970) and David Hargreaves (1967) who focused on student subcultures and the social construction of opposition to the school's dominant culture. Since then the work of Dale (1972), Furlong (1976) and Woods (1983) has demonstrated the existence of many cultures existing in the school which are socially constructed by pupils and teachers alike.

Using Stenhouse's (1967a) notion of culture Rudduck (1977, 1980) adopts a specifically cultural perspective in relation to innovation, and sees the dissemination process as the meeting of two distinct cultures (researcher and teacher). Her conceptualization of the process of 'aculturation' allows her to recognise the power of culture in sustaining a complex pattern of norms which acts against the penetration and modification of the culture of any classroom based on the power of symbolic communication, whilst Elliot (1975) more than most, has succeeded in bridging the gap between these two cultures. Deal and Kennedy (1982, 1983) and Deal (1985) from within the 'effective schools' movement also utilises the concept of culture to formulate their equation that schools with strong cohesive 'cultures' are effective schools, whilst several writers have advised that
schools should develop a capacity for innovation, which involves the development of a culture with 'change supportive norms'.

Such time-perspective analyses are useful and interesting in providing a framework to study the development of research on aspects of innovation over time, yet the categories outlined are often too restrictive when it comes to placing the present study of Branstown School which contains elements of both the cultural and political perspectives viewed within a micro framework. A more advantageous form of location is provided by examining the 'conceptions of man' contained within the strands of research on innovation, which may be classified as 'mechanistic' or 'humanistic'.

(2.2) MECHANISTIC CONCEPTIONS OF MAN.

(2.2.1) THE RATIONAL VIEW.

This is based on the empirical-rational assumption that man is reasonable and will act in a rational manner. Therefore, the main task of the innovator is to demonstrate through the best known method the validity of a certain innovation in terms of the increased benefits to be gained from adopting it. Perplexity relating to why such innovations are not adopted or implemented is expressed in terms of the 'failure' on the part of the teacher to understand and conform to the central prescriptions for action.
which the developers presupposed were clear and unambiguous. As Wise(1977) notes;

"The relationship between the elements of the system are assumed to be known and the manipulation of one element assumed to have predictable consequences for the other elements....programming in this context can only mean programming the teacher." (Wise,1977,p47)

The research-development-diffusion (R.D.D.) approach described by Havelock(1969) is based on this rational view, and has as a major characteristic the assumption of a logical and linear sequence of events from research to dissemination, with a passive consumer who will accept the innovation. The rational view held sway in the 1960's and Stenhouse(1975) points out that the first phase of curriculum development in Britain conformed to this view which incorporated a Tyler(1949) and Bloom(1956) 'objectives' model. Whilst the R.D.D. approach does not exist in 'pure' form in an educational setting, such projects as Nuffield Science, Nuffield Maths, and various Schools Council projects in Britain, along with Better Schools Incorporated in North America, and Innovation in Education in Norway, took similar forms.

The R.D.D. approach has provoked increased scepticism because of its apparent lack of success in bringing about change at the user level, and the Schools Council has expressed great disappointment at the lack of impact its projects have had on the work in schools, and others have also noted the lack of success of this approach in producing change at the classroom level. This lack of impact may be associated with several weaknesses inherent in this approach.
Firstly, innovation is seen as the sole perogative of the researcher, developer, and administrator, with the receiver (the teacher) being seen as essentially passive. Secondly, it contains a 'grand-strategy' for planned innovation not intended to focus on specific human problems, but offers a set of facts and theories which are seen to generate useful products and services which then as innovations are ready to be diffused to anyone who might find them useful, hence the problems of the individual teacher in a particular school is not a concern. Thirdly, it makes the assumption that similarities among classrooms are more important than dissimilarities, and therefore what works well in some field settings will work well in other settings, thus ignoring the possibility that educational innovations are not appropriate for all schools. Finally, it is assumed that new curriculum materials can be relied upon to induce and sustain new patterns of teaching and learning, yet certain findings suggest that in general, nationally produced courses of materials tend to be more radical than those developed by teachers who proceed to impose their own philosophy and pedagogy upon these materials, particularly when the proposed innovation is incongruent with their philosophy, practice and ability.

Similar problems are also associated with Havelock's(1971) social interaction approach, where once again the innovation comes complete from an 'outside' source, and assumptions are made concerning the transferability of an innovation from one school to another. In addition, this approach fails to consider the reasons why potential receivers accept or reject new information since it implicitly
adopts an empirical-rational stance, hence the motivations of the individuals involved in the innovation are not considered. Despite focusing on the 'problems' of the teacher as an active agent, allowing for the possibility of school based innovation, the outside agent as non-directive 'expert' is still present in Havelock's (1971) problem-solving approach. He proposed that school based innovation would increase teacher commitment and the long term survival of the innovation, and as Nicholls (1983) notes;

"They will be, by definition, appropriate for the particular school in which they have been developed and, therefore, will be unlikely to create difficulties related to conflict of aims and pedagogy and of congruence, often associated with innovations developed outside a particular school." (Nicholls, 1983, p18)

This view is questionable on several levels. Firstly, it assumes the school to be an homogenous entity with congruent aims, objectives, and philosophies between departments and within departments. As any observer of schools soon realises this is not so, and for any teacher there are personal 'costs' and 'rewards' associated with proposals for change. Teachers within a school will not only define attempts at innovation differently, they will also have differing conceptions of the problem in the first place, that is if they perceive a 'problem' at all. It is these individual perceptions which are crucial in terms of an individual accepting or rejecting an innovation from whatever source, and this point is made clear in the present study of Branstown School. Becher and Maclure (1978) point to more practical problems;

"There is the more general objection that school-based curriculum development reflects the limitations of sympathy, understanding and cultural bent (not to mention technical skill
in course construction and preparation of classroom materials) of the handful of individual teachers who happen to form the directing group at the top of the school. What if these sympathies and understandings are too narrow, or if the collective cultural orientation is unbalanced or eccentric." (Becher and Maclure, 1978, p171)

The fundamental problem highlighted by this comment is the possible limitations of many teachers in terms of the technical skills required for constructing courses and preparing classroom materials, and whilst this may appear uncomplimentary to teachers several case studies of school based innovation indicate that many teachers do not possess this skill to a high degree. Also, in terms of school based innovation, it is not always possible for teachers to carry out the research phase which the problem solving approach assumes has been completed, and a school based study by Nicholls (1979) reveals that teachers gave little attention to the principles underlying the major dimensions of the innovation. This lack of a research base can lead to the innovation being carried out at a superficial level only, and to combat this Stenhouse (1975) has advocated a research and development role for teachers which has been put into use by Elliot and Adelman (1974) in the Ford Teaching Project.

The work of Schon (1971), particularly in his centre-periphery model, contains a rational view, although as Munro (1971) and Whitehead (1980) point out this model is difficult to apply and evaluate when attempted in a system with dispersed decision making over the curriculum, since in Britain the power and the perseverance lies in the schools and local authorities. Stenhouse (1975) claims
that Schon's (1971) proliferation-of-centres model most closely corresponds to the facts of curriculum development in England and Wales during the 1970's, and the Nuffield Foundation Humanities Curriculum Project provides a good example.

For the most part, within the studies discussed, the prevalence of the rational view of man has led to a lack of concern for individuals as initiators and definers of change. The individual is often ignored as an active agency and this has led many curriculum developers to dismiss the complexity of the teachers work setting, and to misunderstand their language and perspectives. As Wise (1977) has pointed out this basic 'hyper-rationalization' element is a critical deficiency in this view of man.

(2.2.2) THE ECOLOGICAL VIEW.

This is also a form of mechanistic conception of man which moves away from framing the teacher as passive, to place the emphasis on the importance of the complex immediate teaching environment, that is, the 'classroom ecology' as a source of explanation for change. Dreeben (1970) encapsulates this view, in which what teachers do is seen as a consequence of the 'properties' of their classroom, in his comment;

"The most obvious characteristic of the school is the division into isolated classrooms under the direction of the teacher. This fact in itself determines much of what happens in the school." (Dreeben, 1970, p51)
This conception of teacher behaviour uses the biological analogy of an ecosystem to characterise the responses of teachers to their environment, and responses are seen as adaptive in the evolutionary sense. Hence, the environment controls teacher behaviour in some unexpressed way, with the mind of the teacher being seen as a 'black box', interpreting signals from the environment and responding.

Whilst such ecological conceptions act as a reminder of the importance of conditions of the workplace, the tactics for change which arise from it are still interventionist as the teacher is manipulated by others, who use an 'understanding' of the classroom environment to find ways of gaining teacher compliance with plans from the outside.

The ecological view has had a strong influence on those studies that have focused on 'managing change' which have as their goal the creation of conditions within the school conducive to innovations being accepted and implemented. In this vein Fullan (1982) identifies fifteen 'factors' relating to successful implementation, and in 1985 he identifies four process variables essential for school improvement, two of which are intense interaction and communication, plus collaborative planning and interaction. Similarly, Joyce and Showers (1980) consider the conditions for the establishment of peer coaching which necessitates the building of school norms which legitimise and encourage ongoing collegial attention to curriculum and instruction. Clarke et al (1984) provide numerous factors in their summary and synthesis of the findings from effective schools, and Huberman and Miles (1984) in an examination of twelve case
studies of innovation note the positive aspects of such manipulations;

"Large-scale, change-bearing innovations lived or died by the amount and quality of assistance that their users received once the change process was under way......The forms of assistance were various. The high assistance sites set up external conferences, in-service training sessions, visits, committee structures and team meetings. They also furnished a lot of ongoing assistance in the form of materials, peer consultation, access to external consultants, and rapid access to central office personnel....Although strong assistance did not usually succeed in smoothing the way in early implementations, especially for the more demanding innovations, it paid handsome dividends later on by substantially increasing the levels of commitment and practice mastery." (Huberman and Miles, 1984, p273)

A key area for research within the ecological view has been the Headteacher as a 'leader' able to influence the environment within the school to a significant degree. The centrality of the Headteacher in change is generally recognised, although change can occur without the Headteacher's support. This recognition of the Headteacher as ecological controller within the school has led to numerous studies on the role of this individual as an 'active' supporter of change. Firestone and Corbett (1986) provide six behavioural components of Headteacher administrative support, and Liethwood and Montgomery (1986) have developed a 'principal profile' based on four levels of effectiveness (from administrator to systematic problem solver) according to the principal's skills in four domains of behaviour (decision making, goals, factors addressed, and strategies used). Similarly, Manasse (1985) in summarising the dimensions of 'principal effectiveness' lists six factors under 'basic competence' and eight under 'optimal competence'. Characteristically 'guidelines' have been produced to
assist Headteachers to become effective managers of change in terms of creating and directing efforts in an optimal environment.\(^3\)

The difficulties for Headteachers in handling the change environment is clearly recognised, and Handy\(^1\), Hopkins\(^2\), and Purkey\(^3\) have all indicated that the Headteacher is too often involved in what Holley\(^4\) has called 'fire fighting' duties\(^5\) which acts against the creation of the appropriate conditions for change. Consequently, courses in management training have been suggested, and introduced on a wide scale\(^6\), presumably based on the assumption that via immersion in the relevant 'theory' the actual practice in schools will change accordingly. Management training for schools has been focused on by Fullan\(^7\) and Hoyle\(^8\) who both claim that such schemes are not simple solutions to promoting change in schools, and Bailey\(^9\) warns that claims of success through management schemes should be treated with caution. In terms of their operation Southworth\(^10\) has questioned the practice of removing Headteachers from the staff group in order to encourage them to collaborate with the same group, and Schmucks\(^11\) warned that the development of such schemes forms part of what he called the 'fallacy of leadership training'.

There are then, great problems in attempting to manage the ecosystem of the school, even for such powerful role definers as the Headteacher. There are other problems inherent in the ecological view which are recognised by Fullan\(^7\) who notes that a plan is simply that; a plan for doing something , and not the actual
doing of it, the implication being that all plans for innovation should develop ways for the participants to modify and internalise them. As Kanter (1983) notes, "The architects of change...have to operate integratively, bringing other people in, bridging multiple realities, and reconceptualising activities to take account of this new, shared reality" (p305). The paradox for the ecological view is that there has to be a plan to change the environment, but built into the plan must be an awareness that individuals will not simply react as a 'black box' and will modify the plan as their needs require.

Teachers then, have to be recognised as active agencies, and studies within the ecological view have given glimpses of the underlying concerns of teachers which appear to have influenced their use of new ideas. As Herron (1971) notes in reviewing the use of the Biological Studies Curriculum Study materials, "Teacher perception of new course material...is a problem that lies at the root of resistance to curricular change" (p48). Whilst Shipman (1974) in his study of the Humanities Project found that differing definitions of the project were in operation at, "different levels for different groups. The teachers were involved in their own problems, and defined the project out of their experiences in their classrooms. As a consequence the basic principles behind the project were usually misunderstood, and often unconsidered" (p47). He goes on to note, "But every change in routine is a threat to pupil-teacher relations, and to standards of work.....maybe teachers would be more effective and happy with conventional teaching" (p172), whilst Carlson (1965) also
concluded that teachers are often not prepared to abandon the ways in which they normally organise their teaching.

Essentially, the ecological view has stumbled on the problem of formulating an adequate conception of the interaction between the innovative doctrine and school practice, and indicates that there is a need to examine the complex, underlying systems of coping that teachers operate and maintain within the school. In terms of the study of Branstown School neither mechanistic conception of man is acceptable and is therefore rejected, since both are seen to fail on moral grounds, as the teacher is so often ignored as a moral agent. Both the rational and the ecological views remain weak because they remain isolated from the meaning of school events as construed by those involved in the action. As Olson (1982) points out such mechanistic conceptions of man:

"Are ineffective platforms for change because they lead us to ignore the systems of thought that teachers bring to bear on problems by treating teachers as objects of manipulation. Rather than seek more sophisticated methods of manipulation, we need to find out what those systems of thought are like and to do this we have to pay attention to what insiders tell us." (Olson, 1982, p9)

(2.3) ADOPTING A HUMANISTIC CONCEPTION OF MAN

The Branstown Study claims firm allegiance to a humanistic conception of man and is firmly grounded and influenced by the theoretical framework of symbolic interactionism, structural symbolic interactionism, ethnography, and phenomenology, which have been critical in providing researchers with a sound rationale
for focusing on the 'life-world' of both teacher and pupils. However, this venture into the teacher's world is a relatively recent occurrence, and attempts to illuminate educational phenomena from the perspectives and understandings of those involved in the process emerged in the late 1960's with the work of David Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970). Since then there has been a growth of 'ethnographic' studies of schooling in comprehensives, middle schools, infants, junior, and higher education. For many sociologists and psychologists this has necessitated a significant analytical shift towards the classroom as the focal point for research activities.

In terms of the teachers place in the innovation process, Lortie (1975) noted the centrality of the practitioner, but in spite of his analysis those studies that emerged during this period tended to focus on the role of the teacher as he/she experienced change from the 'outside' or 'top-down'. Consequently several researchers whilst recognising the importance of the teacher in implementing educational change, have directed their efforts more to an analysis of the organisational problems associated with change, than on the teachers' experiences within the change process. The growth of the 'school based curriculum development' movement in the mid 1970's was based on a growing awareness of the centrality of the teacher in attempts to create change in schools. As Skilbeck (1976) notes;

"In its simplest terms, school-based curriculum development claims that of all our educational institutions and agencies, the school and the teacher should have a primary responsibility for
determining curriculum content, the learning resources needed for the content, the teaching, learning, and evaluation procedures." (Skilbeck, 1976, p74)

At the core of this movement is the notion of teacher initiated innovation, and Stenhouse's (1975) conceptualisation of the 'teacher as researcher' contains forceful imperatives for the teacher's role in curriculum development, as does the rationale behind the 'action-research' movement. However, at the present time there exists a notable gap in the literature on curriculum innovation with documentation of instances of teacher initiated innovation being sparse indeed. The dominance of mechanistic conceptions of man has meant that there has been little recorded as to how teachers go about the complex task of initiating innovations within their own schools, and what it 'feels like' for those who are involved. There is then a pressing need for knowledge concerning the possibilities and problems associated with teacher initiated innovation from a humanistic viewpoint.

In order to illuminate such problems House (1974) suggests the key is to gain some understanding of the 'phenomenology' of the teacher's world, and Olsen (1982) calls for studies of the 'phenomena of innovation in use'. Hudson (1975) claims that an approach to understanding the view of 'insiders' requires a 'hermeneutic' approach to evidence which involves different kinds of interpretive activity in which the interpreter reconstructs another person's intentions using the other person's terms, or another person's intentions are reconstructed in some new terms. In the present study
of Branstown School, phenomenology is taken to mean a representation and interpretation of the viewpoints of the teachers involved in the action being studied, since this is seen as central in understanding the actions of the teachers. As Kelly (1955) realises:

"Two people can act alike even if they have been exposed to quite different phenomenal stimuli. It is in the similarity in the construction of events that we find the basis for similar action and not in the identity of the events themselves." (Kelly, 1955, p.91)

Hence, the explanation of action is taken to lie in the construction placed upon the context of the action by the teacher, not in the context itself. Thus the essential aspect of research becomes that of understanding the teacher's experience of the context in which action occurs, which necessitates consulting the views of those involved. In this way an attempt is made to understand what the actions mean within the system of thought of the teacher, which means coming to terms with the system as a whole if the meaning of the act is to be understood. As Peters and White (1973) indicate we will not understand the way humans act unless we consult their intentions, as humans are not machines, and Olsen (1982) notes:

"The nature of the dilemmas teachers face in their work can be inferred from what they say about their experiences; about what perplexes them. To understand what teachers are coping with, it is necessary to understand the nature of the dialectical issues they face, and thus to understand the meaning of their consequent patterns of actions. Instead of logical, or mechanical, analysis of the actions of innovating teachers, we discover the viewpoints of the teachers in their own terms. Rather than sit in the back of the room, and then go away and reconstruct what the teacher was coping with, we must talk to the teacher at the very least; otherwise, how are we to know what the behaviour of the teacher means?" (Olsen, 1982, p.15)
The study of Branstown School is clearly focused on the subjective meaning of change for the physical educators involved, how the innovation effected them personally, and how they came to terms with the losses, gains, anxieties and struggles which Marris (1975) claims are involved in all forms of change. He provides a description of the fundamental threat involved in change:

"Occupational identity represents the accumulated wisdom of how to handle the job, derived from their own experience and the experience of all who have had the job before or share it with them. Change threatens to invalidate this experience robbing them of the skills they have learned and confusing their purposes, upsetting the subtle rationalizations and compensations by which they reconciled the different aspects of their situation." (Marris, 1975, p16)

Such threats to self give rise to 'dilemmas' which are similar to, the 'presuppositions that underlie curriculum decisions' as described by Egan (1978), and which emerged in relation to the proposals for change at Branstown School in the form of 'concerns'. By attempting to understand these concerns as they are perceived and resolved by the teachers, it is hoped to gain insights into how teachers come to terms with change. The quest is to illuminate the lived-in world of innovation within the physical education department at Branstown School, by focusing closely on the views of the teachers involved and treating their words and actions as a text for interpretation.
(2.4) PHYSICAL EDUCATORS - THE FORGOTTEN SUBCULTURE OF THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY.

The previous section outlined how the study of Branstown School is an attempt to fill an existing gap in the innovation literature, it is also an attempt to generate knowledge of a an occupational subculture which is not often visited by social scientists. Within the research undertaken by physical educators themselves the majority have adopted a positivistic stance, and it is suggested that naturalistic studies of teaching and learning in physical education are now long overdue. As Evans (1985) rightly points out, a decent qualitative sociology of physical education has been so long in coming that perhaps it has arrived and nobody has noticed, or it has simply failed to get started. Both propositions are partly true, and in 1986 with the publication of 'Physical Education Sport and Society', the first British book to deal specifically with qualitative sociology in this subject, he emphasises once again:

"How great is the need for further qualitative sociological research if we are to achieve a better professional understanding of the nature and purpose of this subject in contemporary British schools and society." (Evans, 1986, p5) 

There remains a desperate need for greater understanding of the lived in world of the physical educator, which necessitates research forms that are sensitive not only to the patterned activities of life on the games field, gymnasium, pool, and sports hall, but also to the interpretations and intentions of teachers located in particular social and organisational contexts. This is particularly
so when one considers the new ideas that have imposed themselves on the consciousness of physical educators in recent years, such as, C.S.E. examinations, games for understanding, and health related fitness. Hence, as Hoyle (1986c) indicates, in Britain today the physical education curriculum is in a state of flux. For many physical educators the practices of decades have become problematic rather than accepted features of their teaching and curriculum, as the subject is placed under close scrutiny within a climate of financial constraints in schools.

The few studies that have dealt with innovation in physical education from a humanistic-naturalistic perspective have indicated a lived in world of great complexity which demands further research. The paucity of naturalistic studies in this area has created a critical deficiency in our knowledge of a subject that touches upon the lives of all school children, and the present study of Branstown School is a modest attempt to reduce the emptiness of knowing concerning the world of the physical educator.

(2.5) NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO.

1. See Katz and Kahn (1964), and Fullan (1972, 1982).
2. For a review see Fullan and Pomfret (1977).
4. Firestone and Corbett (1986) provide a history and state-of-the-art of our knowledge about organisational change in schools.
5. This was pointed out to me in a personal communication from Professor Hoyle in 1986, in which he was commenting on my paper (Sparkes, 1987), and noted that it was a rare empirical example of micropolitics.


10. See Henley (1986), and Holley (1986).

11. These classifications are developed from Olsen (1982).

12. House (1979) warns that this perspective would be likely to dominate in the future.


15. See Dalin (1973), Fullan (1972), and Hoyle (1970).


17. Such as those of Bealing (1972), Eggleston et al (1976), and Hamilton (1975).


19. This is so for the three sub-units of this model, the problem-solving, the task-consultant, and the process-consultant models. The latter adopts normative re-educative assumptions.


23. Bealing (1972), Eggleston et al (1976), Schmuck and Miles (1971), have all noted such superficiality.

24. For a discussion of this project see Rudduck (1976).

25. The work of Barr and Dreeben (1977), Doyle and Ponder (1977), and Saranson (1971) are good examples of this view.

26. This is obviously influenced by Skinnerian behaviourism.

27. See Fullan (1986a, 1986b), and Hoyle (1986a, 1986b) for reviews of studies on managing change.


29. For examples see Crandell (1983).

30. The distinction between 'active director' and 'active facilitator' is often not made clear, see Fullan (1982), and Peters and Austin (1982).


32. Purkey (1984) refers to this as the daily demands of managing leadership, and Handy (1984) calls it 'translating' as opposed to 'transforming'.
development of the National Development Centre in Britain since its inception in 1983.

34. See also Fullan (1982, 1985), and Peters and Waterman (1982).
35. The humanistic view has similar properties to the 'cultural perspective' described by House (1979).
40. Ball (1981a), Burgess (1983), and Riseborough (1981).
42. King (1978).
45. For a review of this shift see Hargreaves, A. (1980).
47. Such as Charters (1973), Gross (1971), and Wilson (1971).
51. This is not to imply that the context is not important, it obviously is, and provides problems, dilemmas, and possibilities for teachers, and needs to be understood as such. The primary source however remains teacher constructions.
52. See Churchland (1979).
54. This term is used throughout this study because it is the term used by the physical educators at Branstown School.
55. As an example Goodson's (1985) 'Social Histories of the Secondary Curriculum', does not include physical education. Other 'low Status' subjects have received attention such as Art, see Bennet (1985), and Sikes et al (1986).
57. Dr. Evans notes in a personal communication in 1986 concerning my own contribution just how difficult he found it to locate physical educators who were engaged in qualitative research for inclusion in his book.
58. See Carroll (1982, 1983). Now consideration must be given to the G.C.S.E.
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CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCHING WITHIN THE NATURALISTIC PARADIGM
(3.1) THE PARADIGMATIC MENTALITY.

The research act at Branstown School did not take place in a vacuum but was located within a given world view or paradigm. Toulmin (1961) likens a paradigm to an "ideal of natural order", which provides "standards of rationality and intelligibility" (p56). Whilst Kuhn (1970) claims they consist of "a strong network of commitments - conceptual, theoretical, instrumental and methodological" (p42), which at certain levels are metaphysical including at least, "some implicit body of intertwined theoretical and methodological beliefs that permit selection, evaluation, and criticisms" (p11). Patton (1978) notes;

"A paradigm is a world view, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world. As such paradigms are deeply embedded in the socialization of adherents and practitioners: paradigms tell us what is important, legitimate, and reasonable. Paradigms are also normative, telling the practitioner what to do without the necessity of long existential or epistemological consideration. But it is this aspect of paradigms that constitutes both their strength and their weakness - their strength is that it makes action possible, their weakness is that the very reason for action is hidden in the unquestioned assumptions of the paradigm." (Patton, 1978, p203)

Paradigms are therefore a distillation of what we think about the world and the way in which we think. Hence actions, including those of the researcher, take place with reference to some paradigm, which has the ability to expand the vision of the individual working within it whilst at the same time inhibiting efforts to move beyond its framework. Research is then according to Morgan (1983) a form of
engagement by which the individual engages a subject of study by interacting with it through a particular frame of reference, having its own assumptions which are rarely made explicit. In making sense of, and in passing judgement on, the Branstown Study the researcher's assumptions need to be made explicit, since as Toulmin (1961) points out, "in studying the development of scientific ideals, we must always look out for the ideals and paradigms men rely on to make Nature intelligible" (p181).

Smith (1983a) has argued that, "two world views dominate research and evaluation efforts: the quantitative-realist and the qualitative-idealist perspectives" (p27). Each paradigm is seen to contain assumptions which Rist (1977) claims are "an interrelated set of views about the social world which are philosophically, ideologically and epistemologically distinct" (p43). Figure 1 juxtaposes the assumptions contained within these two world views which are categorised for discussion into positivistic or naturalistic. Synonyms in the literature for the former include quantitative and empiricist, and for the latter include interpretive, ecological, ethnographic, constructivist, hermeneutical, illuminative, humanistic, phenomenological and qualitative. Hence, contained within the naturalistic paradigm are many forms of inquiry, and it would clearly be a mistake to deny that there are differences among these schools of thought. However, it would also be a mistake not to recognise their similarities, and Giddens (1976) claims that a good case can be made that the, "insights...from [these] schools of thought...stand close to philosophical
idealism" (p55), whilst the positivistic paradigm is based on philosophical realism.

**FIGURE 1. THE UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS OF THE NATURALISTIC AND POSITIVISTIC PARADIGMS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASUMPTIONS ABOUT</th>
<th>POSITIVISTIC PARADIGM</th>
<th>NATURALISTIC PARADIGM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF REALITY</td>
<td>SINGLE, TANGIBLE, FRAGMENTABLE, PARTITIONABLE, EXTERNAL AND STABLE, REALISM</td>
<td>MULTIPLE, CONSTRUCTED, HOLISTIC, INTERNAL AND DYNAMIC, NOMINALISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP OF KNOWER TO KNOWN</td>
<td>KNOWER AND KNOWN ARE INDEPENDENT, DUALISM, OBJECTIVE 'OUTSIDER' PERSPECTIVE.</td>
<td>KNOWER AND KNOWN ARE INTERACTIVE AND INSEPARABLE, 'INSIDER' PERSPECTIVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYNAMICS OF ACTION</td>
<td>CAUSE AND EFFECT LINKAGES. ARE REAL, CAUSES TEMPORALLY PRECEDENT TO OR SIMULTANEOUS WITH THEIR EFFECTS</td>
<td>MUTUAL AND SIMULTANEOUS, RECIPROCAL INFLUENCES. IMPOSSIBLE TO DISTINGUISH CAUSE FROM EFFECT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE OF VALUES</td>
<td>INQUIRY IS VALUE FREE</td>
<td>INQUIRY IS VALUE BOUND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF TRUTH</td>
<td>VERIFIABLE &quot;PROOF&quot;</td>
<td>AMBIGUOUS, COMPLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME OF INQUIRY</td>
<td>TIME AND CONTEXT FREE, GENERALISATIONS, LAWS, NOMOThETIC STATEMENTS, 'OBJECTIVE UNDERSTANDING' POSSIBLE.</td>
<td>TIME AND CONTEXT BOUND, WORKING HYPOTHESIS, IDEOGRAPHIC STATEMENTS POSSIBLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGIES</td>
<td>QUANTITATIVE, NOMOThETIC</td>
<td>QUALITATIVE IDEOGRAPHIC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Earls (1985), and Lincoln and Guba (1985)
The Branstown Study is firmly embedded in the naturalistic paradigm, however, the heterogenous nature of the fields contained within this world view makes it difficult to locate the essential form of the present study in a single term, since these tend to be insufficient when taken in isolation to describe a research form. 'Interpretive', draws attention to the important role of interpretation in this form of research, however, this does not distinguish it from the other forms including positivism which also relies on interpretation. Ethnography is a much used term, yet there appears little agreement as to the essential features which are central to this form, Spradley(1980) claims it is the elicitation of cultural knowledge, Lutz(1981) believes it to be a wholistic analysis of societies, Gumperz(1981) maintains it involves the detailed investigation of patterns of social action, whilst Walker(1981) sees it as a form of story telling. As Earls(1985) points out, the use of a single adjective to adequately define a research approach is not only misleading but simplistic, and in 1986 he suggests that one possible solution is the use of multi-adjectival phrases. Accordingly the Branstown Study was conducted as a form of 'interpretive naturalistic research with an ethnographic perspective utilising qualitative methodologies'. Since the assumptions undergirding the whole study are those indicated in the naturalistic paradigm this term will be used for the sake of brevity in the following discussions.
(3.2) THE PARADIGMATIC DIVIDE.

By claiming allegiance to the assumptions contained in the naturalistic paradigm the Branstown Study explicitly rejects the assumptions of the positivistic paradigm. Even though Smith and Heshusius (1986) claim that since the late 19th century the relationship between the two paradigms has passed from conflict to detente to cooperation, the view taken in the Branstown Study is one of conflict (tempered by mutual respect), with fundamental differences in basic assumptions which Outhwaite (1983) claims includes "an endemic conflict between competing frameworks" (p2). If language can be taken to indicate underlying assumptions then the listing of the words used at a research symposium on the analysis of qualitative data, and recorded by Halfpenny (1979), highlights and crystallises magnificently the two world views in operation. Despite various attempts to reconcile the two paradigms, the author's view is that each paradigm is seen to stand in its own right, generating its own distinctive analysis of social life, which incorporates selected theories that are in fundamental opposition to each other. As Burrell and Morgan (1979) note:

"A synthesis is not possible, since in their pure forms they are contradictory, being based on at least one set of opposing metatheoretical assumptions. They are alternatives in the sense that one can operate in different paradigms sequentially over time, but mutually exclusive in the sense that one cannot operate in more than one paradigm at any given point in time, since in accepting the assumptions of one, we deny the assumptions of all the others." (Burrell and Morgan, 1979, p25)
Similarly Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim, "Postpositivism is an entirely new paradigm, not reconcilable with the old....We are dealing with an entirely new system of ideas based on fundamentally different - indeed, sharply contrasting assumptions." (p33). At a more pragmatic level, attempts to mix-and-match paradigms have resulted in little quality research, whilst the criteria defined from one perspective may not be appropriate for judging actions taken from another perspective, as Bogden and Bilken (1982) point out:

"Researchers, especially novices, trying to combine good quantitative design and good qualitative design have a difficult time pulling it off, and rather than producing a superior hybrid, usually produce a piece of research that does not meet the criteria for good work in either approach." (Bogden and Bilken, 1982, p39)

(3.3) LINKING PHILOSOPHICAL AND TECHNICAL ISSUES.

That the two world views at the epistemological level are distinct and separate cannot be stated too strongly, otherwise a confusion arises between 'philosophical' issues (the appropriate foundation for the study of society and its manifestations), and 'technical' issues (considerations of the appropriateness or superiority of methods of research in relation to one another, for example, direct observation versus the survey. The need for the Branstown Study to overcome this confusion became evident early on to the author when he considered the works of those 'naturalistic' researchers who claimed the paradigms were in some way compatible.
For those within the 'compatibility' school of thought the main concern appears to be to develop criteria and procedures that will do for naturalistic inquiry what certain procedures have done for positivistic research, that is, act as a constraint on our subjective selves, and allow for the possibility of certitude based on correspondence assumptions. Hence, the naturalistic-positivistic debate becomes focused on variations in technique within the same logic of justification. A suitable example is provided by the work of Le Compte and Goetz(1982) and Goetze and Le Compte(1984), who for all intents and purposes ignore the philosophical differences (assumptions) between the two paradigms, and direct their energies to the various techniques that naturalistic researchers can employ to make their approach as 'rigorous' and 'systematic' as their positivistic counterparts. Their discussion implicitly adopts a parallel view of quantitative assumptions, that is, this is how a certain criteria is met in positivistic inquiry, so this is how the same criteria can be met in naturalistic inquiry. Due to this stance, they interpret the basic concepts of validity and reliability in the same way for both positivistic and naturalistic research, and in doing so make the latter no more than a procedural variation of the former, all within the same paradigmatic framework.

In contrast, Miles and Huberman(1984a) recognise that philosophical issues are important, but proceed to 'de-epistemologise' the whole debate by calling for a blending of the two paradigms. They propose that such blending will serve to prevent attention being drawn away from the central task of developing "a body of clearly defined
methods for drawing valid meaning from qualitative data" (p21). They call for researchers to be epistemologically ecumenical and to work on the technical issues that will make naturalistic inquiry "Scientific in the positivistic sense of the word", and point out that, "epistemological purity doesn't get research done" (p21). This form of approach often calls upon Trow's (1957) dictum that "the problem under investigation properly dictates the method of investigation" (p33), and of course the positivistic researcher can supplement data from controlled instrumentation with observations in natural settings, and likewise the naturalistic researcher can supplement participant observation with the quantification of events. As Whyte (1955) noted, his own strategy called for "a weaving back and forth among methods through the various stages of research" (p216), and Douglas (1976) claims;

"Since all research methods have costs and benefits, and since they differ greatly in their particular costs and benefits, a researcher generally finds it best to use some combination or mixture of methods." (Douglas, 1976, p30)

Such assertions are, however, only correct if they remain at the level of analysis that deals with technical issues applying only to specific individual procedures at the 'how-to-do-it' level. The claims then for triangulated strategies is essentially a technical one, and choices over combining methods within a research design are based upon technical considerations, that is, a superior piece of research will emerge if the techniques are combined. However, even if at the technical level methods are commensurable, at the level of philosophical issues the two paradigms are most certainly not. Once
the logic of justification is considered, containing as it does certain basic philosophical assumptions, then vital questions are raised concerning the appropriateness of the methods to be utilised in relation to choosing to operate within a given paradigm. The adoption of the assumptions contained within a paradigm will not only determine the nature of the 'problem' and research focus, but also the meanings attached to the procedures used and the eventual findings. This is to say, that it is not the 'problem' that determines the method, but rather a prior intellectual commitment to a given philosophical position orientates the researcher to conceive of, and formulate the 'problem' within the context of these commitments. This then suggests a linkage between the philosophical issues (logic of justification) and technical issues (methods) which was central to the research process at Branstown School. As Bryman (1984) notes;

"If the research problem is one which directly emanates from a particular epistemological position then the question of the appropriateness of a research technique is significant, for the technique must properly reflect the epistemological framework in which the research is embedded." (Bryman, 1984, p83)

(3.4) CREATING PROCESS RESONANCE IN THE RESEARCH ACT.

In the Branstown Study the methodology was taken to 'flow' from the paradigmatic assumptions, there being a definite linkage between philosophical and technical issues, which in operation should be coherent and congruent. A major assumption of the naturalistic paradigm is that inquiry is value bound in at least four ways, (1) inquiries are influenced by inquirer values as expressed in the
choice of the problem, in the framing, bounding, and focusing of that problem, and the means of evaluating outcomes, (2) inquiry is critically influenced by the choice of paradigm that guides the investigation into the problem, (3) inquiry is influenced by the choice of substantive theory utilised to guide the collection and analysis of data, along with the interpretation of findings, and (4) inquiry is influenced by the values that inhere in the context. Based on these an inquiry may be value resonant (coherent, congruent, and reinforcing) or value dissonant (incoherent, conflicting, and undermining). Hence, a major aspect of judgement relating to the credibility of the Branstown Study is its resonance of process.

The word resonance as an adjective means "resounding: ringing: giving its characteristic vibration in sympathy with another body's vibration". It is suggested that considerations of credibility in relation to a particular study are intimately linked to considerations of resonance, and as such the research process, from the initial paradigmatic assumptions, to the research aspirations, the methodologies utilised, the ensuing forms of analysis and interpretation, which eventually leads to the presentation of findings, should be characterised by a sympathetic vibration between these parts. Part of the credibility of a study would include a consideration of this resonance in which no part should strike a dissonant chord, and any aspect which does produce dissonance would need to be examined in order that its fit and potential for modification be ascertained. The dissonant aspect may then have to
be modified in order for the process to return to a resonant state, as dissonance in the research process reduces the credibility of a study.

The concept of resonance as defined within the Branstown Study allowed for a principled research procedure based on certain criteria as indicated in Figure 2, in which attempts were made to create process resonance from the paradigmatic assumptions, right the way through to the action facilitators, and the final report writing. The term criterion is defined for this purpose as a 'characterising trait' having mild implications for researcher behaviour, and is not an attempt to promote a foundational basis in terms of a standard against which to make absolute judgements for separating a 'good' from a 'bad' study. It is not a prescription as to how studies should be done, but is a characterisation of the particular traits of a particular type of research, and these criteria are based on the way researchers seem to be conducting themselves at present within this format.

FIGURE 2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PROCEDURES TO ENHANCE RESONANCE IN THE NATURALISTIC RESEARCH PROCESS.

RESEARCH ASPIRATIONS.

To gain an insiders or participants perspective in terms of gaining access to personalised information, and learning to perceive as the insider does. To focus on the multiple constructed realities of the participants, and allow the research 'problems' and focus to emerge from the concerns within these realities as significant parameters crystallise.
If possible to generate substantive grounded theory based on a
wholistic analysis, which would include interpretation at the
following levels;
(A) Researcher constructs (2nd order) to be grounded in the
first order meanings of the actors.
(B) The researcher gains insights into the culture that the
actors themselves are not aware of.
(C) Included should be aspects of transferability and
theoretical generalisations where possible.
The above aspirations to be articulated within a research
process that is coherent, consistent, and resonant with the
paradigmatic assumptions, in order to enhance the credibility of
the study.

DIRECTIONAL INFLUENCES.

The meaning of action is context bound.
Human as central research instrument.
Utilise grounded theory approach to allow substantive theory to
emerge.
Utilise tacit knowledge.
Engage in theoretical sampling.
Negotiated outcomes in relation to researcher interpretation if
possible and desirable.
Case study mode of reporting preferrable.
Tentative application of findings.
Tend towards ideographic interpretation.

METHODOLOGICAL POSSIBILITIES.

Participant observation of some form.
Interviews (reflexive).
Documentary analysis.
Life history.
Field notes.
Field diary.
Reflexive diary.
Video recording.
Photographs.
Tape recording.

GROUNDING FRAMES.

(A) PREREQUISITES.

Ordinary settings
Ordinary participants.
Ordinary social context.
Ordinary activities and content
Ordinary actions and behaviours.
Adopt an appropriate research role for the setting.
(B) PERSPECTIVE.

Focus on understanding meanings.
Prolonged and persistent observation with depth and increasing focus.
Holistic and complex.
Research design to be flexible, responsive and evolving.

(C) PROCESS.

Field notes during participant observation. Predominantly open-ended reflexive interviewing.
Multiple data sources within the bounds of resonance.
Data collection tools to be appropriate and meaningful for the particular context.
Search for discrepant cases.
Peer briefings to challenge diligence.
Repeated cyclic analysis.
Analysis and data collection to be simultaneous.
Reflexive field diary.
Reflexive personal diary.

(D) PRODUCTS.

Thick description to enhance contextual information available.
Substantive theory.
Report addresses problems encountered.
Should facilitate tentative transferability.
Description and interpretation should have more emphasis than prediction and evaluation.
Interpretations are plausible, credible, and adequate.
When appropriate findings should be carefully related to other relevant literature from numerous disciplines.
Conclusions to be speculative in initial studies.
Research audit to be facilitated within bounds of confidentiality.

ACTION FACILITATORS.

Adopt appropriate research role.
Adopt appropriate dress for the context.
Adopt appropriate language for the context.
Emphasise confidentiality to informants.
Use key informants.
Get involved in all aspects of participant's life in order to develop trust.
Listen more than talk.
Actor as expert.
Allow for role expansion and creation.
Separate action from researcher interpretation and suggestions in field notes.
Do not break a confidence.
Obtain explicit authorisation before observing, recording, or reading sensitive material.
Observe procedural formalities of the institution.
Check audio/visual equipment.
Retain the right to report your work, as long as the identities of those involved are protected.

[Adapted from Earls (1985)]

Obviously the concept of resonance itself is not an absolute, but is a social construction without definite parameters, that is, what is resonant to one group will not be resonant to another. Also the ability to make judgements about resonance will depend a great deal on the expertise and experience of the audience. To use music as an example, the novice is unlikely to be able to detect or appreciate the subtle variations of interpretation when the same piece is played by different yet competent artists, indeed, this is why he/she is classed as a novice. The highly trained and experienced ear of the 'master', however, will be searching for, and able to detect resonance at a more sophisticated level, which would not simply be related to technical competence, but would include concerns for emphasis, phrasing, touch, along with the overall feel and interpretation of the music.

An additional problem is that there is no necessary 1:1 relationship between philosophical issues and technical issues in the practice of social research, and Snizek (1976) in an analysis of journal articles found that research techniques could not be extrapolated from a knowledge of the researcher's epistemological assumptions. Perhaps,
as Bryman (1984) claims this is the confusion between 'is' and 'ought', whereby many writers feel that the choice of method should be influenced by the attendant philosophical assumptions, yet once research begins more pragmatic concerns dominate. As outlined above the Branstown Study attempts to be a case of 'is' and as such was forced to confront certain critical issues in relation to the implications for research of adopting the essentially antifoundational assumptions of the naturalistic paradigm.

(3.5) SOME PROBLEMS IN CHOOSING AN ANTIFOUNDA TIONAL PARADIGM.

Adopting the assumptions of the positivistic paradigm containing as it does a correspondence theory of truth, allows a position to be adopted whereby a certain set of techniques are seen to be epistemologically privileged, and the 'correct' application of these techniques is seen to be necessary to achieve validity within this framework as attempts are made to discover 'how things really are out there'. As Smith and Heshusius (1986) make clear "for quantitative inquiry, techniques stand separate from and prior to the conduct of any particular piece of research" (p9). The assumptions adopted in the Branstown Study of realities as multiple and socially constructed, with no separation of facts and values, with 'truth' as complex and ambiguous, are essentially antifoundational and thereby undermines the possibility of certitude which is so central to positivistic research.
The central problem to arise from this position in terms of judging the Branstown Study is how is one able to differentiate an adequate interpretation from one that is inadequate? This is not a new problem, and Bergner (1981) in his discussion of Dilthey (1833-1911) notes that he grappled with the problem of what constitutes a 'correct interpretation', and Hughes (1959) describes how Dilthey was caught between assumptions that were antifoundational and a desire for criteria that were foundational. This dilemma which Bernstein (1983) calls, the Cartesian Anxiety of either/or (either we have a foundation for knowledge, or we are adrift in a sea of relativism with no criteria for right and wrong), remains in the work of Lincoln and Guba (1985) which itself recognises antifoundational assumptions but attempts to create foundational criteria for judging research. Whilst the Branstown Study rejects these attempts to impose foundational criteria since there are no 'right' or 'wrong' interpretations of the happenings at Branstown School, as reality is taken to be mind-dependent, with no enduring 'truth' statements that are context free, the study was concerned to present an interpretation that would be regarded as trustworthy by the research community. Whilst Lincoln and Guba (1985) do not define 'trustworthiness' they note;

"The basic issue in relation to trustworthiness is simple. How can an inquirer persuade his or her audiences (including self) that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth taking account of? What arguments can be mounted, what criteria invoked, what questions asked, that would be persuasive on this issue?" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p290)
They then proceed to list several elements for its establishment including credibility (prolonged engagement, persistent observation, and triangulation of sources, methods and investigators, peer debriefing, and member checks), transferability (thick description), dependability (dependability audit), and confirmability (confirmability audit). The Branstown Study directed its energies towards credibility and transferability as its major drive for trustworthiness, and by focusing upon these elements it is hoped to illuminate the tensions that existed and remain for the author in relation to his interpretations of the innovation in Branstown School.

(3.6) ATTEMPTS TO ESTABLISH CREDIBILITY.

(3.6.1) PROLONGED ENGAGEMENT.

Simply 'being' in and around the teachers in the department for an extended period of time was important, and on average two days per week were spent in the school during the academic year 1983-1984, and the researcher has remained in contact with those teachers that remained in the school up to September 1986 for the purpose of follow-up interviews. This allowed the researcher to come to terms with the culture of the department, the institutional bias of the school, and most importantly to build up trusting relationships with the physical educators. It was during this prolonged engagement that the innovation began to emerge as an important issue for the teachers involved, and therefore became the focus of the study°.
This innovation could only be made sense of by the researcher (and the teachers) with reference to the context in which it was embedded, and as Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) argue, objects and behaviours take not only their meaning, but their existence from their contexts. Hence the researcher had to spend time getting oriented to the situation in order to appreciate the context for the actions that resulted in relation to the innovations.

A major concern was that of building trust between the teachers and the researcher, which as Johnson (1975) rightly points out is not simply a matter of applying techniques that guarantee it. At Branstown School building trust was a developmental process which demanded a great deal of time and effort by the researcher, but was rewarded by the insights granted to him once this was established. This process took longer with some teachers than with others and was not linear or stable, but ebbed and flowed, at times there were conflicts which needed repairing. As an example, in December 1983 Monica was in a phase of knitting skiing jumpers, for which I placed an order. When I received my jumper it was far too large so I returned it to Monica. At the time I had a painful back injury from training, was very short of money, plus very short tempered, and my manner in rejecting the jumper must have appeared very curt. This resulted in a period of tension between myself and Monica in which she 'froze me out' of conversations, and it was only resolved when Monica informed me that she felt I had been very rude to her, so I apologised and offered to sell the jumper to somebody else for her.
Trust was then gradually restored and she became an invaluable source of information to me.

Trust was also developed in other ways, beyond my control. In December 1983 I was watching Simon's basketball lesson in the sports hall, when after ten minutes, Peter called down to Simon that he had an urgent phone call. Simon asked me to take over the lesson while he took the call, which I agreed to do, carrying on the practices that Simon had started. After about twenty minutes Simon had not returned, and as I looked up at the balcony I saw Simon and Peter waving at me and laughing. This episode, they explained, had been arranged by the two of them in order to see if I could actually 'do the business' of teaching and wasn't just some 'wally' academic. Such happenings laid the foundations for the firm relationships that developed with these teachers. Other forms of 'testing' were more in my control, and I was often asked in interviews to reveal what other members of the department had said, to which I always explained that all such episodes were strictly confidential.

The researcher's prolonged engagement was noticed and appreciated by the teachers, and in July 1984 Jeremy informed me "When you first came here I think that the men in particular thought, 'Oh yes, another ivory tower wanker come into watch the animals'. But the fact that you have been around the place for so long, helped out, had the piss taken out of you and all the rest of it means that you've been accepted I'd say, your'e not seen as a threat at all, just the opposite". Such acceptance and trust, in terms of getting the
physical educators to be open and frank, was essential for the researcher in his attempts to interpret the conflicts that developed with regards to the innovations.

(3.6.2) PERSISTENT OBSERVATION.

Included with persistent observation should be persistent listening which allowed dimensions of salience to emerge within what could possibly have been a mindless immersion in action at Branstown School. Just as prolonged engagement allowed the researcher to become sensitised to the multiple influences on the teachers as individuals and as a group within the school, so persistent observation allowed the identification of elements in the department that were perceived as relevant by the teachers to the innovation, the 'pervasive qualities' involved in Eisner's(1975) terms. This then allowed for such elements to be focused upon via theoretical sampling. If prolonged engagement can be taken to provide scope to the study, then persistent observation and listening provides depth, and allows the researcher to contextualise the questions during interviews and informal conversations, in order to gain insider understanding.

(3.6.3) A PRINCIPLED TRIANGULATION OF METHODS.

In terms of Denzin's(1978) classification, sources and methods triangulation was utilised in the Branstown Study. The former was
used particularly when the researcher was unable to attend the action in person. As an example, in September 1986 Peter and Simon implied in interview that they had gained a verbal 'agreement' from Alex that they could manipulate the games lessons to once again produce an elitist top-group. In a telephone conversation Alex categorically denied that such authorisation had been given, and that there would be no return to the top-group, and Simon and Peter had misinterpreted a single incident relating to one lesson, which was then explained to the researcher. This form of source triangulation is not intended to ascertain the definite 'facts' of what happened (without actually being present the researcher has no way of knowing what was actually said), but to illuminate the differing interpretations the teachers placed on events which were believed to have happened, as a means of gaining further insights into their making sense of an innovation.

In a similar fashion, it was felt in keeping with process resonance to utilise method triangulation involving interviews, observation, and to a lesser degree documentary analysis. These were not utilised to focus on some external definite 'truth', but to provide different slices of reality at various levels of meaning in order for the researcher to contextualise teacher actions and gain an understanding of teaching and the innovation in their terms. As an example, the interviews indicated that the members of the department were developing a pragmatic coping strategy in relation to the innovation which was used for status enhancement in the educational context of the school, but had little impact on their classroom
teaching. Observations assisted in the researcher's clarification of this strategy as it was seen to develop in its form and content in interactions with senior staff within specific contexts in the school. This led to a researcher classification for this strategy as 'rhetorical justification' which was then focused upon by theoretical sampling. In this sense triangulation makes researcher claims more believable, and provides greater information for the reader to pass judgement with, as Webb (1966) notes;

"Once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced. The most persuasive evidence comes through a triangulation of measurement processes. If a proposition can survive the onslaught of a series of imperfect measures, with all their irrelevant error, confidence should be placed in it." (Webb, 1966, p3)

(3.6.4) MEMBER CHECKING — RESPONDENT VALIDITY.

The member checks at Branstown School were undertaken on a formal and informal basis. Informally as an aspect of being involved with the department, such as, when the list of scale points by subject was displayed on the staff notice board, the researcher raised the issue with the physical educators to 'check' if this confirmed their perceptions of marginality within the school. This aspect was also questioned in interviews, without utilising the word 'marginality' in its sociological sense, but teacher constructions (first order constructs) were used to substantiate and check this researcher interpretation (second order constructs) which has its basis in the concrete world of work at Branstown School.
As such this was an indirect form of member checking, and on those occasions when researcher second order constructs were focused on explicitly, such as strategic political rhetorics, it became clear that the teachers were unable, and often uninterested, in operating at this level which was divorced from their taken for granted world of first order constructs. Schutz(1970) talks of social scientific constructs being "constructs of the second degree, that is, constructs of the constructs made by the actor on the social scene"(p12). Hence in terms of a form of 'validation' member checks of researcher interpretation remains inherently problematic, and raises the issue as to the appropriateness of accepting member checks as a means of demonstrating the credibility of the researcher interpretation as is the case with many researchers. Lincoln and Guba(1985) assume that member checking provides the respondent with an immediate opportunity to correct errors of fact, and to challenge what are perceived to be 'wrong' interpretations. They note;

"The test of isomorphism, in principle impossible to apply within the conventional paradigm, becomes the method of choice for the naturalist. In order to demonstrate 'truth value', the naturalist must show that he or she has represented those multiple constructions adequately, that is, that the reconstructions (for the findings and interpretations are also constructions, it should never be forgotten) that have been arrived at via the inquiry are credible to the constructors of the original multiple realities." (Lincoln and Guba,1985, p296)

Douglas(1976) adopts a similar view and sees member validation procedures as useful in discovering "if members recognise, understand, and accept one's description of the setting"(p131). Hence, he suggests that research findings (including
interpretations) are 'validated' to the extent that the teachers studied recognise and endorse the researcher's account of their social world, which implies that 'lay' assessment (of teachers) are validators of 'professional' (researcher) judgements. However, as noted, at Branstown School this form of communication was very difficult, and the relationship between lay and professional assessments is extremely problematic.

As Schutz (1967) has argued, laymen produce their own distinct sociological accounts of their social worlds, and these will inevitably differ from the accounts produced by sociological researchers, since each is formulated in relation to different purposes at hand. Hence, a teacher's sociological account will only have that degree of clarity, consistency, and elaborateness required by the teacher's purposes at hand, and therefore cannot be directly compared with a researcher interpretation which is constructed for different purposes, which may include concerns for completeness and consistency. As Bloor's (1983) study indicates clearly, not only do members' purposes at hand produce particular accounts, but they also produce distinct member readings of and reactions to the researchers account, and in terms of a validation exercise he felt that the doctors and patients in his study were assessing sociological accounts in the light of their own purposes and interests rather than in the light of researcher purposes.

"To expect otherwise is to require the member, in a rather ethnocentric manner, to suspend his own various interests in his activities and enter into the sociologists selective frame in order to respond to that report. Members, then, may even come to incorporate the researcher's account into their own stock of
knowledge of the world because of its adequacy and relevance for their interests; such incorporation may possibly be interpreted as evidence of validity. Alternatively, it may be objected that the researcher is validating his analysis only in a rather perverse way, by making the world over in the image of his analysis!" (Bloor, 1983, p170)

Another problem which advocates of member checking tend to gloss over is that there is no reason to believe that an insider’s view of a particular phenomena is necessarily more valid than an outsider’s view of the same phenomena. This is particularly pertinent to the Branstown Study since one of the research aspirations was to gain insights beyond those available to the teachers involved. As an example, the removal of non-specialist teachers from years 1-3 at Branstown School was interpreted and justified in various ways by the physical education staff, such as, giving the pupils a better chance of learning skills, allowing more time to build relationships, and improving departmental discipline. Building upon these, the researcher using literature from sociological theory, interpreted this action as an attempt to reprofessionalise a subject area. Similarly, during 1983-1984 the researcher interpreted Alex’s management style as ‘autocratic’, yet he felt his style was ‘democratic’, but on attending a management course in 1984-1985 which forced him to reflect on his strategies, Alex then claimed he had been operating in an autocratic style. In this and other matters at Branstown School, there is little reason to believe that the teachers’ interpretations of their own action is any better, that is, more valid than the researcher’s interpretation. As Miles and Huberman (1984b) note;
"Even if people do not themselves apprehend the same analytical constructs as those derived by researchers, this does not make such constructs invalid or contrived (We are all, for example, surrounded by lawful physical processes and mechanisms of which most of us are, at best, remotely aware)." (Miles and Huberman, 1984b, p.19)

It is therefore inadequate to assume that the teacher's own meanings are necessarily the most valid. Essentially, questions of meaning are ultimately questions about language selection, and such questions cannot be answered by recourse to empirical evidence. This is equally so within the positivistic paradigm, and as Philips (1983) realises, there is no critical test, that is, no single test, that can be used to decide absolutely between rival positions. This is not to deny that the member checking that did take place at Branstown School has no relevance to the findings, but the teachers' pronouncements were not treated as a test of adequacy for researcher interpretations, at this level the theoretical adequacy is best judged by the academic peer group (although similar problems still apply). Importantly, the member checking undertaken itself became a rich source of generated material that was highly pertinent to the researcher's analysis. This additional material was a source of data and not a form of 'test', and itself was subjected to interpretation and analysis to discover the meanings embedded in the context for the teachers, which enriched and extended the researcher interpretation. As Emerson (1981) has argued, "taking findings back to the field is not a test but an opportunity for reflexive elaboration" (p.362).
(3.7) TRANSFERABILITY.

Within a positivistic framework this would be interpreted as external validity, and the concern for generalisation within case study research is dealt with in more detail in a Chapter 4. Suffice to note at present that the degree of transferability is a direct function of the similarity between two contexts, or 'fittingness' in Lincoln and Guba's (1985) terminology, which they define as "the degree of congruence between sending and receiving contexts" (p.124). Hence, if school 'A' and school 'B' are 'sufficiently' congruent, the working hypotheses from the originating context may be applicable to the sending context. Therefore, the person who wishes to make a judgement of transferability needs information about both contexts in order to be able to pass judgement, and transferability inferences cannot be made by an individual who knows only the sending context.

Since the researcher cannot hope to know all the possible contexts to which another may wish to transfer his working hypotheses, the 'burden of proof' lies less with the original researcher than with the person wishing to make the application elsewhere who has access to empirical evidence about contextual similarities. What is required from the original researcher is the provision of sufficient information about the context in which the inquiry took place, so that any other person interested in transferability has a base of relevant information for making judgements of similarity. This information is best provided in the form of 'thick description' as
outlined by Geertz(1973), although just what constitutes 'proper' thick description, is at this stage of naturalistic theory development still not completely resolved. Its interpretation in terms of the Branstown Study has been to rely heavily on presenting the views as explained by the teachers themselves in their own language with regards to the innovation, plus providing descriptions of action within the various school contexts associated with the changes.

(3.8) TENSIONS ARISING FROM THE LACK OF A COURT OF LAST RESORT.

The previous consideration of credibility has attempted to indicate how problematic this aspect of research is to establish in naturalistic inquiry, if indeed it is possible at all, since the assumptions of multiple constructed realities in which reality is mind-dependent, seriously undermines the notion of applying foundational criteria to distinguish untrustworthy interpretations from trustworthy ones. If multiple realities is accepted as an assumption then this is to deny that there are any 'givens' upon which to found knowledge, and different claims about reality result not from using incorrect procedures, but may be a case of one researcher interpretation versus another. In a world of multiple constructed realities there would appear to be no 'court of last resort' to appeal to (as there is in theories accepting the correspondence principle which affords a 'Gods eye view'), making it difficult to define and judge an adequate interpretation from amongst many others. As Smith and Heshusius(1986) note;
"Qualitative inquiry, in refuting that the rationality of inquiry is derived from method (as practices), must address the implications of its antifoundationalist assumptions. However, it must do so without slipping on the mantle of quantitative inquiry and its foundational assumptions. Given the demise of truth as correspondence there clearly is no refuge here. Thus, the debate over research approaches is very much part of the intellectual challenge of objectivism versus relativism." (Smith and Heshusius, 1986, p10)

The Branstown Study clearly is drawn to a coherence theory of 'truth' in which a proposition is justified 'true' (read adequate) if it coheres (is consistent and connected) with other propositions or schemes in the network. Coherence is thus a matter of internal relations and the process resonance that has been discussed may be taken to be vital to principled naturalistic inquiry in this sense. However, once again the question arises as to how do we agree as to the basis for 'truth'? As Grayling (1982) realises, "it is logically possible for there to be any number of internally coherent systems of beliefs, and since there is no external criteria for choosing amongst them, it cannot be known which is the 'right' one" (p137).

Without an independent reality to which individuals have independent access, a coherence theory must ultimately respond to the idea of common understanding, in which the scheme or network is held to be 'true' only to the extent that a group of individuals have come to agree, conditioned by time and space, that it is 'true'. Therefore, in naturalistic inquiry, the basis for 'truth', or trustworthiness, or adequacy, is social agreement, conditioned by time and space. This means that whilst differing researcher interpretations may be subject to questions of internal consistency (coherence) and
resonance, there is no nonarbitrary set of criteria that can be employed to resolve the difference between competing interpretations. If, as Taylor (1971) proposes the sciences of man are hermeneutical, then it is involved with interpreting the intentional, meaningful expressions of people, and providing interpretations of the interpretations people have already given to their own situations. Then, at best, the researcher can offer an interpretation and hope that others will 'catch on' or accept this interpretation as adequate. If they do not, he suggests that nothing outside the hope of common understanding can be used to compel agreement, and notes;

"We can only convince an interlocuter if at some point he shares our understanding of the language concerned. If he does not, there is no further step to take in rational argument; we can try and awaken these intuitions in him; or we can simply give up; argument will advance us no further." (Taylor, 1971, p6)

Therefore, disagreements with the researcher's interpretation of the Branstown Study cannot be resolved simply in terms of adopting certain procedures as opposed to others (at the technical level). The strategies of principled triangulation, prolonged engagement, prolonged observation, and member checking are only convincing in so far as these procedures make sense to the reader. If they do, then the credibility of the study is enhanced, however, the problem remains that what makes good sense depends upon how one reads the situation, not only the general situation of naturalistic research, but also the specific situation of any particular study, not only in terms of the actual interpretation, but also in terms of how the interpretation is obtained. As Taylor (1971) notes;
"Ultimately, a good explanation is one which makes sense of the behaviour; but then to appreciate a good explanation, one has to agree on what makes good sense; what makes sense is a function of ones readings; and these in turn are based on the kind of sense one understands." (Taylor, 1971, p14)

Hence, there is no way in a foundational sense, despite the attempts of Lincoln and Guba (1985), to isolate a 'good' interpretation from a 'bad' interpretation. There can be numerous yet theoretically and descriptively coherent interpretations, and what makes sense depends upon the kind of sense that the individual understands. The researcher is then left to convince another of the appropriateness of a particular interpretation by appeals to common understanding, and if no such understanding prevails, then there is no 'higher authority' to which appeal can be made to resolve the issue.

(3.9) MOVING BEYOND THE SOLOPHISTIC MORASS.

In attempting to come to terms with the implications of adopting the assumptions of the naturalistic paradigm, the Branstown Study came to reject in principle the 'compatibility' approach of Le Compte and Goetz (1982), the 'de-epistemologisation' of Miles and Huberman (1984a, 1984b), and whilst strongly influenced initially by the 'parallelism' of Lincoln and Guba (1985) this was rejected once it became clear that these authors were naturalistic only so far into the research process, and then donned on the cloak of positivism to 'confirm' results. These acts left the author feeling increasingly concerned and anxious as to how to justify his interpretation of the
happenings at Branstown School without falling into the solophistic
morass described by Donmoyer (1985) who notes;

"The field of education has become a solophistic morass where
one researcher's conclusions must be judged as adequate as
another's even when their findings conflict; where even the
shadiest of scholarship can be made impervious to criticism by
the claim of paradigm difference." (Donmoyer, 1985, p14)

If all interpretations are as adequate as another, then as
Philips (1983) points out, this does away with the concept of a
'mistake'. However, as Soltis (1984) reminds us, to be open to other
peoples views and interpretations is not to be empty minded, "it
does not release us from exercising judgements" (p9). In terms of
this stance judgements are made in relation to questions of meaning,
that is, the meaning of phenomena, which are fundamentally different
from questions of 'truth'. Questions of meaning are questions about
what language should be used to frame propositions about the world,
whereas the truth or falsity of the resulting propositions can be
assessed empirically, empirical evidence cannot establish the
validity of a language, since languages are not true or false; they
are appropriate or innapropriate, or more or less adequate.

In this sense French is not 'truer' than German, but each is more
appropriate in certain contexts and for certain purposes. Hence, if
one is in Germany and wishes to communicate with a local, then
German (on the whole) would be the appropriate language to use. Also,
one language may be more capable than others for expressing certain
ideas, for example the eskimos have twenty two words for snow (each
contains information about the form and texture of the snow), in
English there is but one. Similarly, there is no equivalent in a behaviouristic vocabulary for the Piagetian notion of conservation of number, likewise the notion of reinforcement cannot be translated into the Piagetian's specialised vocabulary. Such issues allow for the consideration of purpose when asking questions of meaning in naturalistic research. This is important since meaning is not 'drawn' from the data, but is imposed upon it by the researcher. In this sense data does not speak for itself, since for this to happen it must be translated into a language, and as Donmoyer (1985) notes, "languages are inventions, not discoveries" (p17).

The notion of 'purpose' is central to the works of Toulmin (1961, 1972, 1983) who believes that there is such a thing as scientific rationality, and that there are ways to rationally assess the relative worth of conflicting claims, and as such provides a possible escape from relativism. Toulmin (1961) claims that the notion of purpose plays a central role in all science, whereby different purposes will inevitably result in different criteria for appraising the relative adequacy of conflicting/competing conceptual schemes or languages. By using the analogy of games he argues that each scientific discipline is undergirded by its own particular purposes. Hence, fundamental disagreements over purposes within a discipline will lead to divisions into subdisciplines, such as, linguistics has divided into psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics, and the adequacy of the conflicting paradigms is assessed not in terms of criteria relevant to all scientific activity, but in terms of the particular purposes that characterise a particular discipline.
In his consideration of public policy fields and scientific disciplines Toulmin (1972) argues that the adequacy of human constructions, be they scientific paradigms, artistic, literary creations, or public policy decisions, must always be judged in terms of particular purposes. This can be translated to the more local level of the Branstown Study, since its adequacy needs to be judged in relation to its intended purposes as outlined in the research aspirations in Figure 2, in which an attempt was made to create process resonance in order to match these purposes.

Clearly the tensions and anxieties that have been discussed in relation to the Branstown Study have not been resolved, but remain an integral part of the development of educational research for future consideration. It is clear, however, that if the choice is made to work within the naturalistic paradigm, then the desire to remain foundational in terms of a knowledge base must be cast aside, and this has implications which call for a drastic rethinking amongst leading scholars in the immediate future. Perhaps as Rorty (1979) suggests we should dispense with the traditional ideas of objectivity and truth, and realise that we as individuals are 'beyond method'. From this antifoundational perspective, social inquiry according to Rorty (1982) is best seen as "continuous with literature - as interpreting other people to us, and thus enlarging and deepening our sense of community" (p203), and these interpretations are not concerned with certitude but are an attempt to enlarge the 'conversation' and keep it going.
How these developments are to take place remains uncertain, particularly in relation to the application of Toulmin's ideas on purpose, and the development of such procedures will not be easy. As Lincoln and Guba (1985) note concerning their own work:

"There is still a major gulf between the theoretical definitions of trustworthiness criteria and the means of operationalizing them. It is one thing to suggest that triangulation is needed, for example, and quite something else to say how much, or what type of triangulation will suffice to establish a minimally acceptable level of trustworthiness." (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p330)

That such leading authorities in the field remain unsure is reassuring to note, and gives some comfort to the author in his anxieties concerning the nature of interpretations and judgement in the social sciences. The implications that have been discussed are of course speculative, since not only the solutions, but even the precise nature of the problems of adopting an antifoundationalist stance is extremely unclear at present, and how these problems are worked out, one way or another, definitely merits the serious attention of researchers in the future.

(13.10) NOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE.

2. Burrell and Morgan (1979) reinforce this view.
3. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) also note that naturalism adopts a positivistic stance to the social world. Naturalistic inquiry has no connection with the philosophy of naturalism.
4. This rejection is in part an expression of the authors disillusionment with the positivistic paradigm within which he operated at school and in undergraduate studies. It is also located within the contemporary history of the positivist-naturalistic debate which can be traced back to the late 19th century, and the emergence of an interpretive approach to social inquiry as a reaction to positivism. For an outline of this


6. Those claiming compatibility include, Cronbach(1980), Reichhardt and Cook(1979), and Weber(1864–1920) discussed in Benton(1977) and Outhwaite(1983). Runciman(1983) claims there is no fundamental logical gulf between the natural and social sciences, and of reportage, evaluation, explanation, and description, only the latter is peculiar to social science. However, his conceptualisation of 'primary' and 'tertiary' understanding appear to be aspects of the same process characterising human actions, so the gap between the social and natural sciences appears to widen once more.


8. This was possible because no prior hypothesis had been formulated for testing, other that the question 'how do physical educators make sense of their job?'. It is interesting to note that Freeman(1983) is highly critical of Margaret Mead precisely because she appears to have spent so little time learning the Samoan culture before focusing on her particular area of interest — adolescent girls.


10. Positivism claims to transcend this problem, and claims one need not know anything about either originating or receiving contexts to know the 'truth' of a generalisation, assuming only that originating and receiving context are in some sense part of the known population of contexts, and that the generalisation is based upon a study of a representative sample of contexts.

11. See also Lincoln and Guba(1985).

CHAPTER FOUR

ON THE USE OF CASE STUDY
(4.1) ON DEFINING A CASE.

Despite its use in a variety of fields\(^1\), case studies of schooling according to Crossley and Vulliamy(1984) are a relatively recent phenomena, yet as Aldeman et al (1976) note they are "often regarded with suspicion and even hostility"(p139). A good example of this hostility would be the attack by Atkinson and Delamont(1985) on the evaluation case studies undertaken by those in the CARE\(^2\) tradition, they note, "but in advocating a (vaguely) ethnographic approach, these case study writers often seem in danger of reinventing the wheel: what is worse they seem rather slapdash wheelwrights at that"(p32).

Whilst the Branstown Study has been influenced by the CARE work it recognises that their stated purposes are different, since they tend to place an explicit emphasis on evaluation rather than analysis\(^3\), leading to (on the whole) descriptive studies which often lack rigour in terms of data collection, and a theoretical framework within which to make sense of the data, this being particularly so in the case of 'condensed fieldwork'\(^4\). The Branstown Study is clearly a research orientated rather than a client orientated case study, and as such derives its base from different theoretical traditions, including the curriculum innovation literature, and approaches contained within the sociology of education, and in particular the work of the 'Manchester School'\(^5\) under the direction of Max Gluckman who had as their central concern the social processes operating in schools and the perspectives of the actors involved.
Whatever the approach adopted, the actual concept of case study remains an ambiguous one, since it means different things to different writers operating in various research frames. For example, Smith (1978) treats "educational ethnography, participant observation, qualitative observation, case study or field study...as synonyms" (p316), whilst Skilbeck (1983) differentiates the case study from both ethnography and participant observation, and in contrast several anthropologists, including Spindler (1982) and Wolcott (1982) argue that ethnographic case studies are incompatible with evaluation. In a different vein, House (1980) suggests a transactional approach which utilises interviews to focus on individual perceptions of a given educational phenomenon, and the case study is seen to be almost entirely qualitative in its methodology. Scamm (1971) claims the central tendency amongst all case studies is that they try to illuminate a decision of set of decisions, why they were taken, and how they were implemented. Other 'central tendencies' claimed are 'organisations', 'processes', 'programmes', 'neighbourhoods', 'institutes', 'events', and 'instances'. Hence, the distinguishing features (but not exclusive to it) of case study according to Kenny and Grotelueschen (1984) are:

"...to provide some sense of parameters...we can say that case study may be marked by the following: data are qualitative; data are not manipulated, studies focus on single cases; multiple perspectives are solicited; holism is activated; humanism is encouraged; and common and/or non-technical language is used." (Kenny and Grotelueschen, 1984, p38)

A well known definition provided by Aldeman et al (1976) is that "a case study is an umbrella term for a family of research methods
having in common the decision to focus an inquiry around an instance" (p74), whilst Nisbet and Watt (1980) suggest it is "a systematic investigation of a specific instance" (p74). Just what constitutes an 'instance', is not fully articulated by these writers, and it remains unclear as to whether they are referring to an instance in time, or an instance as a singular and perhaps exemplary event or phenomena. Aldeman et al (1976) suggests that an instance in action is defined by its boundaries, and that the boundaries are defined by the principle of internal cohesion, however, as Stenhouse (1978) points out;

"The choice of a boundary is convenient rather than compelling. Some period boundaries would do violence to the unity of the survey, but a range would be acceptable so that there is real choice, which needs to be justified in terms of the coherence achieved in handling......it is the potentials for coherence and the development of interpretation which governs decisions as to boundaries." (Stenhouse, 1978, p18)

Hence, the boundaries of a case remains problematic, and it still remains as to how one recognises an 'instance' when it occurs. This ongoing conceptual ambiguity amongst leading case study theorists has led them to seek justification for the case study by appeals to phenomenology, hermeneutics, tacit knowledge, and epistemological authority, but all such appeals have been questioned and undermined by Kenny and Grotelueschen (1984). In terms of the 'case' of innovation at Branstown School its nature, as Kemmis (1980) suggests, is indeterminate, that is cases cannot be prespecified or pre-selected, instead it is the active agency and constructions of the researcher that makes or invents the case. This is particularly relevant to the Branstown Study where the innovation emerged as the
focus of research after the field was entered, and originally the researcher had intended to contain the case within the academic year 1983-1984. However, on leaving the field it was felt beneficial for the researcher interpretation to 'extend' the case until September 1986 via interviews, in order to gain greater understanding of the happenings in 1983-1984. As Kemmis(1980) notes, "The case study worker makes the case by carrying out the study. He attempts to transform the situation from an object of perplexity into an object of understanding." (p117). Accordingly, reality only becomes a 'case of something' through the researcher's interpretation, and via his/her objectification of what is going on in the concrete situation of time and space, in Schutz's(1962) terms, when it becomes an "object of his contemplation" (36). In keeping with this Kemmis(1980) reminds us that;

"Creating the case is a kind of bootstrapping process: the objects of the case study are created by the observer's and other participants' objectification of these, that is, by rendering them as objects of discourse. In short the 'phenomena' with which the case is concerned must be created by the observer. They are objects of the imagination." (Kemmis,1980,p120)

What counts as a 'case' and its 'boundaries' is therefore highly problematic, since naturally occurring systems are not self evidently bounded. The boundaries are indeed a matter of construction, by both the actors and the researcher, and it needs to be noted that at the time of writing, the innovation at Branstown School and its implications for the teachers involved is still in progress. Cases and instances are recognisable only as cases or instances of *something*, which is socially constructed, and the range

- 72 -
of potentially relevant dimensions or criteria is immense. This has led Atkinson and Delamont (1985) to rightly argue:

"It is therefore quite meaningless for the authors of case-study persuasion to write as if the world were populated by 'cases' whose external status and existence were independent of methodological and theoretical concerns." (Atkinson and Delamont, 1985, p. 29)

An attempt was made in Chapter 3 to make explicit the researcher's dependence and linkages with various theoretical and methodological concerns, within which the case of 'innovation' must be seen as a construction of the researcher formed in his interaction with the physical educators at Branstown School. The phenomena, that is, the innovation is based in substance, in the empirical world, however, it is the extraction of this as a conceptualised case of innovation that is clearly a researcher construct which is based on the interaction with, and interpretation of the given multiple realities of those in the department, and recognises the centrality of the researcher as a reflexive agent when the case study is used as a research strategy.

(4.2) THE CASE STUDY AS A RESEARCH STRATEGY.

Yin (1981b) suggests that there has been a confusion amongst users of case study between 'types of evidence', 'methods of data collection', and 'research strategies'. Such confusion is well evidenced in the literature, and Nisbet and Watt (1980) claim that there has been a growing acceptance of case study "as a research methodology in its own right, and a recognition that it is possible
to develop general procedural guidelines" (p4). In contrast Kemmis (1980) notes;

"Case study is often regarded as a method. It is sometimes thought of as merely pre-experimental, as a mysterious process in which, by some alchemy, the dross of experience is transmitted into the gold of the experimentally testable hypothesis.....the method of case study is not a single technique or even a set of techniques. It is not a machine which generates a case when 'pointed at' the world." (Kemmis, 1980, pp122-123)

He points out that if case study is treated as a technique, and is regarded in the same light as 'experimental' research, then inappropriate tests of validity and reliability will be employed, and as indicated in Chapter 3, the Branstown Study should not be judged by the criteria of the positivistic paradigm. In a similar fashion Aldeman et al (1976) refute the notion of case study as a method, and make it clear that it should not be conceived as a standard methodological package. Hence, the research methodology is not defining of case studies. The case study methodology can in theory be eclectic, although techniques and procedures in common with the naturalistic paradigm tend to be used most often. Therefore, case studies should not be equated just with observational studies, since this would rule out historical case studies, nor is the case study merely pre-experimental, since the understandings generated in a particular case are of significance in their own right. As Yin (1981a) points out, the case study does not imply the use of a particular kind of evidence, and can be done using quantitative or qualitative evidence, he notes;

*What the case study does represent is a research strategy, to be likened to an experiment, a history, or a simulation, which
may be considered alternative research strategies."
(Yin, 1981a, p100)

Hence, as a strategy the case study is a guide to seeking data, how this data is collected, that is, by participant observation or surveys is a separate issue not determined by the choice of case study as a strategy, since as indicated in Chapter 3 these are determined by the choice of paradigms. Using the notion of strategy Yin (1984) is able to highlight the key features of the case study which made it appropriate for the investigation at Branstown School.

"A case study is an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used." (Yin, 1984, p23)

Such a definition is useful since it clearly distinguishes the case study from other forms of research strategy. The experiment deliberately divorces the phenomena from its context, so that attention can be focused on a few variables, and typically the context is 'controlled' by the laboratory environment. A history, does deal with the entangled situation between phenomenon and context, but usually with noncontemporary events. In contrast the survey can try and deal with phenomena and context, but their ability to investigate the context is extremely limited, for example, the survey designer constantly has to struggle to limit the number of variables to be analysed, which influences the number of questions that can be asked, in order to fall safely within the number of respondents that can be surveyed.
A RATIONALE FOR CHOOSING CASE STUDY AS A STRATEGY.

Case study was the strategy of choice at Branstown School as opposed to the survey, experiment or history, since it was seen to have distinct advantages in terms of collecting and analysing empirical evidence, and was in keeping with attempts to create process resonance. Case studies can of course be used for exploratory, descriptive or explanatory work, and Eckstein (1975) offers the following five categorisations of case studies.

(1) Configurative - Ideographic: presents depictions of the overall configuration of individuals or systems. It largely represents intuitive interpretation.

(2) Disciplined - Configurative: a particular theoretical framework is used in the interpretation of the case.

(3) Heuristic Case Studies: deliberately used to stimulate the imagination toward discerning important general problems and possible theoretical solutions.

(4) Plausibility Probes: going for a pilot case study before launching the study on a massive scale.

(5) Crucial Case Studies: similar to the crucial experiment in the natural sciences. It is offered normally to test or reject certain a priori theoretical propositions.

The problem with such a categorisation of strategy forms is that the boundaries between the strategies appear clear and distinct, yet even though each strategy has its own distinctive characteristics, there are large areas of overlap between them, and the Branstown Study contained elements of (1), (2), and (3) at different phases of the study. The main concern in choosing this as a research strategy was to maintain process resonance, and avoid gross misfits with
paradigm assumptions. In its consideration as a strategy three conditions were considered.

(1) The type of research question posed.

(2) The extent of control the researcher had over actual behavioural events.

(3) The degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events.

Yin (1984) relates these conditions to the five major research strategies in the social sciences: experiments, surveys, archival analysis, histories and case studies, suggesting that the latter is most appropriate when the form of question is that of 'how' and 'why', there needs to be no direct control over behavioural events, and the focus is on contemporary issues. The questions contained in the Branstown Study were of the how and why kind, for instance, why are some of the teachers 'anti' the innovation, and how do they articulate their resistance in the social context of the school? The criteria of control and the degree of focus on the contemporary as opposed to historical events was also influential in forming the researcher choice of strategy, and allowed certain distinctions between histories, case studies, and experiments to be made evident.

Histories are the preferred strategy when there is virtually no access or control, and their major contribution is in dealing with the 'dead' past, that is, where no relevant persons are alive to report, even retrospectively, when, why, and how something occurred. In such a situation the researcher relies upon primary and secondary
documents along with the physical and cultural artifacts as the main sources of evidence. Historians, do of course, investigate contemporary events, and in doing so their strategy tends to overlap with that of case study. However, the case study is the preferred strategy in examining contemporary events, in situations where the relevant behaviours cannot be translated. Thus, the case study relies on many of the same techniques as used in a history, but has at its disposal two major sources of evidence not usually available to the historian, that is, direct observation and interviews. One of the case study's unique strengths lies in its ability to deal with evidence from a variety of sources, such as, documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations, whilst in some situations involving participant observation, informal manipulations can occur. Note, that based on the assumptions contained within the naturalistic paradigm as a principled research procedure, that any attempts to control events at Branstown School would have been inconsistent with the concept of resonance as outlined in Chapter 3. In terms of maintaining process resonance the case study was the strategy of choice in a situation dominated by 'how' and 'why' questions concerning contemporary events, in a social situation in which the researcher had no control, or desire to control the teachers involved.
(4.4) PROBLEMS OF TRANSFERABILITY - GENERALISATION IN CASE STUDY RESEARCH.

(4.4.1) ENABLING A SURROGATE EXPERIENCE.

If one accepts the standard definition of generalisation given by Kaplan (1964);

"The generalization must be truly universal, unrestricted in time and space. It must formulate what is always and everywhere the case, provided only that the appropriate conditions are satisfied." (Kaplan, 1964, p91)

Then, as Nisbett and Watt (1980) note, the findings of case studies are not easily generalisable, except by an intuitive judgement that 'this case' is similar to 'that case', and likewise Tripp (1985) claims this form of research is notoriously immune to generalisation. However, as indicated in Chapter 3, the generalisations produced in case study may simply be different from those of experimental approaches. Aldeman et al (1976) propose that three kind of generalisations are possible from case study:

(1) From an instance studied to the class it purports to represent, for example, a study of comprehensivization in one school may tell us about comprehensivization in other schools.

(2) From beyond case features of the instance to a multiplicity of cases. Studies in which the case is selected as an instance of a class will be predisposed to such generalisations.

(3) Generalisations about the case. Tend to be studies which do not begin by asserting an instance-class relationship.

The type of generalisation is seen to be dependent upon the boundaries of an 'instance', and the difficulties in defining a case
and its boundaries have been dealt with previously. Despite these difficulties, Aldeman et al (1976) argue that since the case study is firmly located in the interpretive tradition of the social sciences;

"In practice the two most important differences are in the way claims are made against truth and in the demands made upon the reader. Experimental research 'guarantees' the veracity of its generalisations by reference to formal theories and hands them intact to the reader; case study research offers a surrogate experience and invites the reader to underwrite the account by his tacit knowledge of human situations. The truths contained in a successful case study report, like those in literature, are 'guaranteed' by the 'shock of recognition'." (Aldeman et al, 1976, p96)

Such a distinction is evident in Stakes's (1978) notion of 'naturalistic' and 'formalistic' generalisations. The former is characterised by a full and thorough knowledge of the particular, which extends itself via personal experience so that recognition can take place in new and foreign contexts. He notes;

"That knowledge is a form of generalization too, not scientific induction but naturalistic generalization, arrived at by recognising the similarities of objects and issues in and out of context and by sensing the natural covariations of happenings. To generalise in this way is to be intuitive and empirical, and not idiotic." (Stake, 1978, p6)

Such generalisations are seen to develop within the person as a product of experience and relies on a basic knowledge of how and why things are, how people feel about them, and what is likely to happen in other circumstances with which the individual is familiar. This knowledge as experience is, therefore, essentially private and personal, and cannot perhaps be transferred. As Matavana (1970) reminds us, that which we believe to be transferable, 'objective knowledge', must always be created by the listener. Only when the
listener understands does objective knowledge appear to be transferred, which of course is dependent upon whether the individual is prepared to understand.

Such private knowledge does, however, have to be communicated if naturalistic generalisations are to occur, that is, to convert their understandings individuals must be involved in a form of exchange which involves engagement in public discussion, which is a key component of scientific practice. Based on such exchanges, it is hoped to give others a broader range of surrogate experience than they would otherwise have, and that the generalised insights that can be taken from this experience will help the individual act more intelligently in future contexts. Such a view of naturalistic generalisations is in part supported by Cronbach (1975);

"In order to give a wide reach to our explanations, we make experience cumulative by abstracting from it. The explanatory constructs that we find fruitful combine into a view of his institutions, and his behaviour. The informed public projects each new circumstance against that background, and also is able to react more intelligently." (Cronbach, 1975, p125)

The implication of Cronbach's (1975) view in accordance with that of Aldeman et al. (1976), and Stake (1978), would appear to be that projections across situations is a form of reasoning or generalising by analogy rather than the discovery of law-like empirical relationships. The information presented in thick description does not contain general propositions to be tested, nor does it conclude with findings that appear as lawful generalisations. The data from case study is used as an example of the kind of thing that happens
in situations like that. The reader is provided with the 'advantages' of the researcher's interpretive insights into what happens in a given social context. These insights then have to be transferred by analogy by the receiver to other social contexts, who must be on the look out for analogous situations in which these insights can be applied. Hence, it is up to the consumer to decide what aspects of the case apply in new and different contexts, and generalisation by analogy can only occur when the consumer recognises that an analogous situation has been encountered, which in itself presents a problem, since it is not always clear just what is to count as an analogous situation. This places a strong demand on the researcher to describe the contextual details and the patterns of perceptions employed by individuals in the action and the social 'rules' governing action, so that the consumer can anticipate when the analogy is appropriate and when it is not. As Hamilton (1977) in discussing his case study of an open plan primary school notes:

"I assumed that an appreciation of the historical and cultural location of a 'case' is pertinent to the development of a valid interpretive account. In effect, (this) elevates 'context' to the status of a defining attribute." (Hamilton, 1977, p.22)

However, just what to include remains problematic, and Ortony (1979) distinguishes between 'literal' and 'metaphoric' similarity. The former are contained in statements like, 'Billboards are like placards', the latter in, 'Billboards are like warts'. The point being that literal similarity statements have been traditionally the basis of generalisation in social research, yet people do generalise experience in other ways, of which metaphor is a respectable form of
case to case generalisation. Tripp (1985) develops the notion of literal similarity which is seen to succeed or fail depending upon the match of features in the known to the unknown entity, and in terms of a match in the levels of salience between the two. Based on this conceptualisation:

"...the major problem of generalization of case study appears to be one of developing criteria for judging what features of a case are salient, and hence should be documented." (Tripp, 1985, p187)

Using anthropology as an example Tripp (1985) indicates that the features of a case may, at one level, be dichotomised into two general classes: those which are unique to the case, and those which are common to a group of cases. Full documentation of the former will lead to 'comprehensiveness', and the latter 'comparability'. The comprehensive features of a case are impossible to predict since they are the unique features of the case, and can only emerge as the fieldwork proceeds. In the case study such unique differences are precisely the information upon which case to case generalisations depend, and so must be fully documented and explored. In contrast, comparable features of case study may be systematised into a research convention, becoming a technical routine, the comprehensive features are always perceived by the researcher alone, and the adequacy of documentation, and the analysis in this respect is entirely dependent upon the skill, ability, interests, experiences and biases of the researcher. This then shifts the ground for making inferences from case studies, that is, the extrapolation is in fact based upon the validity and adequacy of the analysis rather than
the representativeness of the events, and this has obvious linkages to the problematics of researcher interpretation which have been discussed in Chapter 3.

The conceptualisation of naturalistic generalisation as based on analogy has been influential, in the Branstown Study, and within the limits of the author's ability to represent the realities of others it is hoped that the documentation of the innovation is able at points to induce a vicarious experience for the reader, whilst an attempt is made to provide sufficient contextual detail in order that the reader may construct his/her own generalisations. In addition there is an attempt to promote generalisation at the theoretical level, since one of the research aspirations was to develop a substantive theory of change in relation to Branstown School.

(4.4.2) CASE STUDY GENERALISATION AND THE CENTRALITY OF THEORY.

Often those advocating naturalistic generalisations seem to reject the possibility of theory generation, yet as Barton and Lawn (1981) point out, even the most 'naturalistic' and 'realistic' literary account is the outcome of a highly artful and conceptual effort on the part of its maker, which is itself theory laden. This point tends to be overlooked within the CARE tradition and Atkinson and Delamont (1985) note on this;

"A denial of theory and method is, we believe, a denial of responsibilities for one's research activities and conclusions..."
concern for ethics too often supplants equally important issues of theory and method." (Atkinson and Delamont, 1985, p37)

In addition, as Barton and Lawn (1981) point out a commitment to 'naturalistic' research does not remove the problems of interpretation and theory. Hence to present research findings as non-problematic and 'natural, instead of embedded in a matrix of assumptions, as has been indicated in Chapter 3, is to reduce the power of the reader to make generalisations by analogy. Whilst the present study has attempted to remain close to the common sense world of the practitioner, it is clearly recognised that the practical concerns of the social actors and the theoretical concerns of sociological analysis are different, since in the latter the successful unravelling and explication of mundane beliefs and actions demands the suspension of common sense, not its uncritical endorsement. The production of second order constructs enables theory to take a central place in generalisation, which can operate in tandem with naturalistic generalisations. As Yin (1984) notes;

"The short answer is that case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, case study, like the experiment, does not represent a 'sample', and the investigators goal is to expand and generalize theories (analytical generalization) and not to enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization)." (Yin, 1984, p21)

The above comment recognises the general confusion between procedures appropriate for making inferences from statistical data, and those appropriate to the study of an idiosyncratic combination of elements which constitutes a 'case'. Mitchell (1983) distinguishes between statistical inference on the one hand, and scientific or
causal (logical) inference on the other. The former is concerned with the process by which the researcher draws conclusions about the existence of two or more characteristics in some wider population from some sample of that population to which the researcher has access. The latter is the process in which the researcher draws conclusions about the essential linkage between two or more characteristics in terms of some systematic explanatory schema, some set of theoretical propositions. Hence, the process of inference in case study is of the logical or causal kind, and not the statistical, with the transferability from one case to another being based only on logical inference. He notes;

"We infer that the features present in the case study will be related in a wider population not because the case is unassailable. The emphasis on case studies is used to relate theoretically relevant characteristics reflected in one case to another, in a logically coherent way. logical inference is epistemologically quite independent of statistical inference."

(Mitchell, 1983, p200)

These are similar to the kinds of inference identified by Znaniecki (1934), which were, enumerative and analytical induction. The former induction abstracts by generalisation, whereas the latter generalises by abstracting.

"The former looks in many cases for characters that are similar and abstracts them conceptually because of their generality, presuming they must be essential to each particular case; the latter abstracts from the given concrete case characters that are essential to it, and generalises them presuming that insofar as essential, they must be similar in many cases."

(Znaniecki, 1934, p306)

Such analytical induction is seen as central to case study generalisation and implies the influence of theory, that is, the
extent to which generalisations may be made from case studies depends upon the adequacy of the underlying theory, and the whole aspect of the related knowledge in which the case is analysed, rather than the particular instance itself. Besides which, the single case only becomes significant when set against the accumulated experience, knowledge, and foreshadowed problems, that the analyst brings to it. Ultimately, as Mitchell(1983) notes;

"The validity of the extrapolation depends not on the typicality or representativeness of the case but upon the urgency of the theoretical reasoning....In terms of this argument case studies may be used analytically - as against ethnographically - only, if they are embedded in an appropriate theoretical framework." (Mitchell,1983,p201)

The theoretical framework of the Branstown Study has its basis in symbolic interactionism and phenomenology, and in the later chapters of the study which focus on the details of the innovation at the School, attempts are made at the beginning of each chapter to locate the theoretical underpinnings on which the researcher interpretation was made, in order that the reader can judge the appropriateness of the researcher judgements in relation to the theories used. The provision of thick description also allows for naturalistic generalisation to be made by the reader, and allows theoretical principles to be inferred. In this sense the Branstown Study attempts to accommodate both forms of generalisation in keeping with Becker's(1968) view of case study;

"(The case study) attempts to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the group under study. At the same time the case study also attempts to develop more general theoretical statements about the regulations in social structure and process." (Becker,1968,p233)
Hence, the Branstown Study does not see itself in the position of either producing naturalistic or theoretical generalisations, since as Lincoln and Guba(1985) realise the researcher is not dealing with an either/or proposition, and that the alternatives include more that deciding between nomic generalisations on the one hand and particularised knowledge on the other.

"But of course the issue before us is not of the either/or variety. Between the poles of the most general (nomothetic) and the most specific (ideographic) is the broad range of the related; we are dealing here with a continuum, the two ends of which do not begin to encompass all the possibilities that exist." (Lincoln and Guba,1985,p123)

As indicated in Chapter 3, generalisations unrestricted to time, space, and context are not seen as feasible products of inquiry within the naturalistic research paradigm, and the notion of transferability was discussed, which provided a link with theory and context by the use of the 'working hypothesis'. As Cronbach(1975) notes, "When we give proper weight to local conditions, any generalisation is a working hypothesis, not a conclusion"(p125). Thus the working hypothesis provides the point of linkage between the naturalistic generalisations dependent on thick description, and the theoretical generalisations which are the product of fracturing the data into researcher second order constructs. Both however, remain locked into the data produced in the field in order that the congruency between context 'A' and context 'B', and the theoretical interpretations can be judged.
The approach in the Branstown Study was to attempt to 'get the best of both worlds' in terms of the capacity of the study to allow generalisations, and as such is part of the development of the case study as proposed by Tripp (1985) who calls for the development of substantive theory from case study findings, which are essentially descriptive, without losing the feature of precise contextualisation which remains an essential condition. He outlines four tentative steps for this 'middle way' in the future:

1. A number of cases documenting many instances of educational principles in action would be collected. These must have built into them the necessary requirements for precise contextualisation and cumulation, in terms of 'comprehensiveness' and 'comparability'.

2. They must be made readily accessible, so that patterns and regularities which are the basis of substantive theories may be discerned in them.

3. These substantive theories must then be related to what we already know about human society.

4. The nexus of theory would then inform our understanding of educational situations which we could then investigate. So each individual case study would not only exist in its own right, but would also contribute to a cycle of progress in the scientific understanding of education.

This middle way would free the researcher from the potential straight jacket of restricting attention to the particular setting available to the study, and allows for the integration of a variety of theoretical concepts from a variety of fields, for example, the Branstown Study utilises concepts from organisational theory and educational theory, in order to make sense of the case, whilst at the same time permitting the researcher to move beyond it. This also allows for the development of a comparative analysis, in which
theoretical insights emerge and knowledge cumulates, which is essential if studies are to be developed into more general theoretical frameworks, as opposed to being doomed to remain isolated one-off affairs.

(4.5) NOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR.

1. These include, clinical psychology, law, medicine, anthropology, organisational and management studies, community psychology and sociology, and journalism.
7. See Aldeman et al. (1976) and Walker (1981). The latter claims that pure fiction may be included in a research account of a case.
CHAPTER FIVE

ON THE USE OF INTERVIEWS
(3.1) ON FORMS OF INTERVIEW.

"Without allowing people to talk freely we will never know what their real intentions are, and what the true meanings of their words might be." (Cottle, 1978, p12)

Conversation and formal interviews were a central method for gathering data in the Branstown Study and is in keeping with the anthropological tradition initiated by Malinowski (1922), who recognised the importance of talking to the natives, in order that researcher statements could be made that 'grasped the natives point of view'. In the Branstown Study interviews were seen as a method in line with the research aspirations as outlined in Chapter 3, one of which was a concern to describe and generate theory concerning the subculture of physical educators, with particular reference to the members understanding of the social world in which they operate.

Concerning the forms of interview available, the methodological literature describes a wide variety that would appear suitable for use at Branstown School, such as, 'unstructured', 'depth', 'intensive', 'probing', and 'reflexive'. Each of these has similarities, but certain characteristics need to be highlighted in order to locate the form of interviews used in the present study.

To use the term 'non-directive' would be a misnomer, since as Whyte (1982) suggests, whilst this form may have value in clinical settings, a genuinely non-directive approach is simply not appropriate or desirable for research purposes. On a practical note
Hargreaves et al.(1975) have outlined the difficulties in developing a non-directive way of questioning teachers about classroom activities, which can often induce a stressful state for the teacher. At Branstown School there was an attempt to maintain some element of this approach in that the teachers were given the freedom at any time to introduce materials into the interview that were not anticipated by the researcher, this being so even in the later stages when the content of the interviews became more focused.

On the structured-unstructured continuum as indicated by Burgess(1982) the Branstown Study interviews would be located at the unstructured end. Structured interviews are those with a specific schedule, and form of questions, together with specific alternatives (an oral questionnaire). As Bechhofer(1974) points out, these define situations in advance and do not allow the researcher to follow up any interesting idea that may emerge. In contrast, Palmer(1928) claims that unstructured interviews provide the opportunity for the researcher to probe deeply, uncover new clues, to open up new dimensions of a problem, and to secure accurate, vivid, inclusive accounts from informants that are based on personal experience. This corresponds to the concept of the 'depth' interview as outlined by Jones(1985), who points out that if a priori definitions are to be found then it is not a depth interview, since what is meaningful to the respondent has already been predicted. This prediction significantly prestructures the direction of inquiry within the researcher's frame of reference, in a way that gives little time and space for the respondents to elaborate their own.
Such a situation is seen to encourage the researcher to overlook vital information which may emerge, and would be the opposite of the researcher's intentions in the Branstown Study.

There remains the problem that all interviews are structured by both the researcher and the respondent. Nor is the interview just a 'conversation with a purpose', initiated by the researcher. The crucial point to be made is that there is no presuppositionless research, and whilst we are not slaves to our framework, we are tied to them. Hence, even in the unstructured interview the researcher has certain themes in mind that he/she wishes to cover, for example, at Branstown School the first interview with each teacher had a biographical intent, with the following areas being covered, school experience, college/university experience, and experiences in the first teaching post.

Having these broad categories to cover should not be seen as an attempt to constrain the situation, since the intention is to ask more questions arising from issues raised by the respondent. This excludes the direct imposition of a theoretical framework which predetermines precisely what will be asked, and thereby forces the elaboration or modification of the researcher's prior schemes, and in some cases can lead to their abandonment, for example, in the Branstown Study the researcher's conception of monetary reward as the major motivating force in the desire for promotion was quickly dispelled and reorientated. Hence, as the interviewer responds to what is emerging during the interviews from the respondent, a
balance is maintained between restricting ambiguity and restricting structure. Such an approach also allows various focii to emerge as patterns of response become evident, thereby allowing the researcher, utilising his grounded understanding of those with whom he has contact, to explore in some directions rather than others, that is, undertake theoretical sampling.

To avoid ambiguity in terminology Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) propose a distinction between 'standardised' interviewing, and 'reflexive' interviewing, in order to differentiate between the survey and the ethnographic interview, and the term 'reflexive' best describes the interviews in the Branstown Study. They recognise that in the latter the researcher does have a number of themes or issues he would like to cover in the interview, but the form of the interview is not restricted to non-directive or directive (open v closed) questions. The use of these forms of questions varies within interview and between interview, depending upon what happens during the actual interview. In the main non-directive questions were preferred in the Branstown Study early on, for example, 'How did you get into physical education?', since such questions act as a trigger intended to stimulate the respondent into talking about a particular broad area. This was based on the premise that;

"A question which sharply defines a particular area for discussion is far more likely to result in omission of some vital data which you the interviewer, have not even thought of." (Dexter, 1970, p55)
This was so even when particular aspects of the innovation were focused on, for example, the proposed structural change in the timetable. Directive questions were avoided where possible, unless a definite yes/no was needed to clarify a point for the researcher, for example, 'Would you be prepared to teach mixed classes?'. This form of question would then be followed by one asking for the reasoning behind the choice. In accordance with Spradley (1979) three main forms of questioning predominated at Branstown School:

(1) Descriptive - allowing the respondent to provide statements about the activities.

(2) Structural - attempting to find out how the respondents organise their knowledge.

(3) Contrast - allows respondents to discuss the meaning of situations, and provides an opportunity for comparison to take place between situations and events in the respondents world.

It remains easier to consider such issues when involved in the analysis of such data after the interview and the problems of the 'immediacy' of the situation during the interview should not be overlooked. The role of the interviewer needs to be practiced, and in the Branstown Study the author's confidence and contextual knowledge coupled with the gradual social acceptance by the teachers made the interview a more fluid and openly interactive as the study progressed.

The notion of reflexive interviewing at Branstown School removes completely the view of the interviewer as passive, and apparent passivity should not be mistaken for actual passivity, since the interviewer has to be an active listener. He must learn to listen
and reflect on what is being said, locate emergent themes, probe for clarification and consider relevance to research focus. All this without forcing the respondent to merely agree with the preferred categorizations of the researcher, as Dean et al (1967) note;

"The researcher should be a thoughtful and analytical listener, and observer, who appraises the meaning of emerging data for his problem and uses the resulting insights to phrase questions that will further develop the implications of these data." (Dean et al, 1967, p302)

Maintaining such a 'critical awareness' is very stressful for the interviewer, and the researcher's previous experience in 'practic e interviews (with teachers not involved in the present study) plus the experience at the school itself, indicated that his own attentional span was one and a half hours at the maximum. After this concentration waned and normally problematic statements and issues raised by the teachers were not picked up, they were glossed over, and 'taken for granted', as the analytical perspective became blunted. It is interesting to note that even very experienced researchers such as Burgess (1984) and Measor (1985a) also recommend the same period as the cut off point for reflexive interviews, for the researcher's sake not the interviewee who can often talk indefinitely.

(5.2) RATIONALE FOR CHOOSING REFLEXIVE INTERVIEWING.

The use of reflexive interviewing is an attempt to maintain resonance within the research process, and as has been indicated in previous chapters their use is consistent with the author's 'model of
man' and paradigmatic assumptions, in which people construct the meaning and significance of their realities. They do so by bringing to bear upon events a complex personal framework of beliefs and values, which they have developed over their lives to categorise, characterise, explain and predict events in their world. Hence, in order to understand why individuals act as they do, we need to understand the meaning and significance they give to their actions. As such, reflexive interviewing allows the researcher to gain insights into such meanings. As Jones (1985) states:

".....to understand other persons' constructions of reality we would do well to ask them (rather than assume that we know merely by observing their overt behaviour), and to ask them in such a way that they can tell us in their terms (rather than those imposed rigidly and a priori by ourselves), and in a depth which addresses the rich context that is the substance of their meanings (rather than isolated fragments squeezed onto a few lines of paper)." (Jones, 1985, p46)

There were other important reasons for choosing to utilise reflexive interviewing, which will be summarised in the following sections.

(5.2.1) PROVIDING ACCESS.

They provide access to a variety of situations which is necessary to gain a balanced view of the culture under study. Highly important is that they permit the researcher to engage in "theoretical sampling". Here the researcher explores emergent themes and ideas about the impact of certain events on teacher attitudes and experiences by choosing respondents and events that can clarify and elaborate on the emerging constructs and categories.
Access is also provided to situations where the researcher is unable to observe. Denscombe (1983, 1986) notes how the classroom is like an isolated capsule which shrouds events from outside observation, and the 'privacy' and 'autonomy' of teachers in the classroom has been noted by House (1974) and Lortie (1975). Other areas, such as the Headmasters office are also private areas, plus the single researcher cannot be everywhere at once nor can he/she negotiate access to all situations, for example, at Branstown School access was refused to senior level curriculum committees, but 'access' was gained by interviews with Alex who sat on these committees, and often such access was not crucial since it was the respondents interpretation of these meetings and not their exact content which was of interest to the researcher.

(5.2.2) INFORMATION RETRIEVAL.

There are benefits in terms of information retrieval, allowing the researcher to gain information helpful to his understanding of the situation. They are particularly useful in collecting information about events beyond the immediate context, but which are thought to be of influence upon it. This includes data on significant events before the research began or beyond the scope of the research context, for example, the first interview with all the physical educators was biographical in nature, plus in interviews details were gathered concerning the previous Headmaster and Head of Physical Education who had now left the school, but whose legacy was to have an influence on the emergent innovations. As
Goodson (1983) points out, to understand the significance of others' actions, information is needed on the biography of teachers, and such information, whilst it may be sought through interviews, is unlikely to be produced by observation or even participation.

(5.2.3) PROVIDING A PERMANENT RECORD.

Interviews, if tape recorded and transcribed exactly as was the case in the Branstown Study, offer a source of 'hard data' which provides a permanent record of the events which is available for re-examination by other researchers, and is not entirely dependent upon the subjective recall of the researcher involved. This allows for a form of dependibility audit, and where information is taken from interview transcripts for use in later chapters, a reference is provided in the notes to the chapter locating it in the researcher files in order that they may be inspected, plus examined to place the comment in a wider context for reinterpretation if needed, or to facilitate interpretation from different research frames. Importantly it provides first order constructs from which second order constructs may be obtained and examined, which allows the adequacy of the researcher interpretation to be judged.

In such situations, the researcher is in many ways placed in the position of the 'oral historian'², using the interview as his main evidence gathering device, with the case record akin to the historians 'primary source' or 'first record'³. The oral historian is characterised as a 'collector of specimens for later examination',
that is, the researcher is able to develop his/her interpretations after the evidence has been collected. As Stenhouse (1978) maintains;

".......criticism or theorisation is so far as possible deferred until the worker has gathered the material and it is based on the handling of that material. It is a retrospective analysis." (Stenhouse, 1978, p35)

From a grounded theory perspective as utilised in the Branstown Study the notion of a 'pure' retrospective analysis is untenable and undesirable, since data collection, coding, theoretical generation and categorization are seen to operate simultaneously. The notion of 'oral historian' does, however, indicate how the continued, rigorous, and cyclic analysis of interview data after leaving the field, can enrich and illuminate insights gained in the field which allows further theoretical categories to emerge. It is interesting to note that Stenhouse (1982) admits that observation has a role to play in conjunction with the interview, and that sometimes observation or 'noticing', is an unavoidable consequence of being in the situation. In addition he also recognises that the interview is often dependent upon observation, or at least, on the interviewer's experiences of similar situations to the one under study. However, the analogy of the oral historian should not be taken too far since the researcher in the field 'creates' his sources, the historian does not.

(5.2.4) CONVENIENCE OF DATA COLLECTION.

Interviews are a convenient method of collecting data. It is economical in terms of time and resources, particularly as a means
of collecting factual information and background data about the
department and the school, this being an important consideration in
view of the financial constraints under which the Branstown Study
was conducted. This needs to be set against the demands of full
transcription which in the present study was in the ratio of one
hours interview to five hours transcribing (there was over forty
hours of interviews taped with Alex alone), and then numerous hours
of analysis.

Importantly when working with teachers in their hectic daily
routine, interviews allow a high degree of scheduling, and can be
arranged to meet the mutual needs of the researcher and the teacher.
Free periods were often utilised at Branstown Study and several
interviews were carried out at the teachers' homes, this often set a
'natural' time limit on the interview, for example, the length of the
teaching periods was one hour, at other times the teacher dictates
the duration, such as, in her third interview Monica made it clear
that she had to leave at a certain time to attend a House meeting.

(5.2.5) ENCOURAGING TEACHER TALK.

Particularly, reflexive interviews are useful in encouraging
respondents to talk about areas of relevance to them in their own
words, that is, it has the effect of eliciting a members account
which inherently focuses on respondent problems and their analyses
of these, rather than being moulded to fit categories created by the
researcher.
Importantly, the act of reflection itself by the teacher on his/her practices allows him/her to explain certain events and activities which would otherwise be obscured from the researcher by their embeddedness in the implicit assumptions shared between members. Upon reflection, and with appropriate probes and questions from the interviewer, these taken for granted assumptions may be exposed which serves to enhance the researcher's appreciation of events and teacher perspectives.

(5.3) ADOPTING A REALIST PERSPECTIVE IN RELATION TO THE EVIDENCE GAINED IN INTERVIEWS.

The interviews at Branstown School were approached as a series of friendly exchanges to focus on how the teachers perceived the innovations in relation to their lived in world. As such no attempt was made to control the relationship between researcher and researched, since as Finch(1984) and Oakley(1981) note, this is an impossible and undesirable task in a social situation where there needs to be trust and confidence between those involved. From a positivistic stance this would lead to claims of interview bias, and the works of Brenner(1981,1985), and Brown and Sime(1981) indicate such a concern with their calls for a 'neutral' interviewer stance in all forms of interviews. Even a committed interactionists, such as, Denzin(1970) displays a concern for 'problems' that may 'distort' the respondents replies creating sources of 'invalidity'. Becker(1966) has argued that all formal interviews create bias, and that data gathered in more 'naturally' occurring situations via unsolicited
accounts, are more valid than the evidence gained in solicited accounts. However, as Hammersley (1979) indicates in describing a staffroom incident where his mere presence effected the content of a conversation between two teachers, even in such situations the researcher may have an effect. In contrast Jones (1985) reorientates the argument by suggesting that bias is not something to be avoided at all costs, but is something to be used creatively, contingently, and self consciously. There being no definitive, standardised rules possible concerning the reflexive interview, and the approach will depend upon the understanding the researcher has of the person and the kind of relationship they develop between them. She notes;

"What is crucial is that researchers choose their actions with a self conscious awareness of why they are making them, what the effects are likely to be upon the relationship, and indeed whether their theories and values are getting in the way of understanding those of the respondents." (Jones, 1985, p49)

In addition the proposed context specificity of accounts has often been seen as a problem, and Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) note, "interview data, like any other, must be interpreted against the background of the context in which they are produced." (p126). There would then, appear to be major concerns in relation to the evidence gained in interviews, either interviews are situated encounters where what is said only makes sense in context, or they are simply research methods to get at 'facts' which are context free. The positivistic tradition is consistent in maintaining the latter position, whilst the ethnomethodologists align themselves with the former. Others, such as the interactionist Denzin (1974) seems to
want to occupy both positions, arguing in theory for the former position, but in practice rejecting it and adopting the latter with recommendations for 'triangulation' to obtain greater validity. This would indicate a tension between choosing to focus on the content of what people say as a neutral report of the world (a positivist view), or treating interviews as situated ceremonial orders where the focus is on the force of what people say and do (interactionist). This dilemma is well presented by West (1979);

"Essentially, the problem revolves around the distinction between the content of accounts, which at face value might be used to support various propositions, and what people are 'doing' with their talk." (West, 1979, p.719)

In the former the validity of accounts and their subsequent value for research, is concerned with the 'fit' between accounts and 'reality'. Hence, the criteria of validity relates to the content of the accounts and the possibility of treating the content as an accurate representation of events and members understanding, that is, an 'information' analysis in Hammersley and Atkinson's (1983) terms. However, accounts are also important in their own right for what they tell us about those who produce them. Accounts given can be used as evidence of the perspectives of particular groups or categories of actor to which they belong, and the knowledge of these perspectives formed an important aspect of the interpretations developed in the Branstown Study, which involved a 'perspectives' analysis in Hammersley and Atkinson's (1983) terms.
Any discussion on interviews needs to consider the position of the ethnomethodologists, who display an extreme disregard for the validity of content. Garfinkel (1967) proposed that the significance of accounts is not to be found in the surface structure or content of what is displayed, so much as in the interpretive and interactional procedures which generate them. Within this perspective, the account is a datum in its own right, and is of interest in its method of creating/checking on the reciprocity of perspectives and generating a social structure at an interactional level. In terms of validity the concern becomes not with the extent to which the content is 'true', but relates to the extent to which it displays the methodic character of social interaction.

Such an ethnomethodological view holds that talk is determined by the present situation of giving an account, in which the account is more dependent on the present situation than on the circumstances being accounted for. Hence, what the actors say about their actions and intentions cannot be used by sociologists to explain behaviour. Scott and Lyman (1972) claim that an account is simply a linguistic device employed whenever an action is subjected to valuative inquiry. An extreme formulation of these views would propose that, people do not have motives for their actions until they are in some way challenged to produce them by others, and at this point they choose a motive on the grounds of it producing the right interactional outcomes, rather than because of its proximity to what the actor might feel to be the truth.
Bruce and Wallis (1983) are highly critical of this ethnomethodological position, since they claim it presupposes what it is being used specifically to deny, namely that it is possible to penetrate the 'real' motives and reasons for action, that is, without grounds for believing that the individual did not act for the reasons advanced, why should one believe those reasons to be post hoc generalizations? Hence, some insight into 'real' motives must underlie any claims that the motivational theory being advanced by the actor is not what it seems. They are also highly critical of Garfinkel's (1967) work, and imply it is formulated within a positivistic framework, attempting to avoid all bias based on aspirations to a more scientific and objective status, gained by concentrating on how participants 'observably acquire their accounts of action', which is seen to be linked to Watsonian Behaviourism. Such an approach 'escapes' the problem of indexicality (language conveys meanings peculiar to particular contexts used - meanings are not universal but situated) by means of its shift from issues of meaningful content to issues of form. Bruce and Wallis (1983) clearly indicate that in ethnomethodology motives are definitely imputed to the actors, but the motives are not those that the actors claims in their talk, "The analysts suppose that their subjects are driven by some variant of the desire to appear rational, decent, sensible and honest, and a desire to win some interactional advantage" (p65).

These authors also suggest that even the 'purest' form of conversation analysis rests upon inferences regarding motivation and
propose that the conventional use of actor's talk as a key to their motivation is appropriate. They note;

"Most social science depends on taking actors' talk as a guide to something other than the structure of their talk and its interactional setting, and that holds even when the actors talk is confined to answering 'yes' or 'no' to items in an interview schedule. If the motivational stories told by actors are denied explanatory status then most of what passes for social science is undermined". (Bruce and Wallis, 1983, p61)

As a response to such dilemmas the Branstown Study draws upon a 'realist perspective' with regards to the evidence gained in interviews, as indicated by Silverman (1985) who contrasted the various approaches to language in terms of an externalist (positivist) and internalist (interactionist and ethnomethodological) perspectives. He points out that;

"Interviews do indeed display realities which extend beyond the reality of conversational practices, so that when interviews take place, we witness both artful and possible universal conversational practices and the display of cultural particulars expressing variable social practices. Put another way, the internalist concern with form and universality and the externalist commitment to content and variability are complementary rather than contradictory." (Silverman, 1985, p170)

He goes on to develop a realist perspective based upon a strand within interactionist theory which suggests that we need not hear interview responses simply as true or false reports of reality, but instead, they can be treated as displays of perspectives and moral forms. In suggesting this Silverman (1985) can be seen to provide a link between interactionist concerns over understanding the reality of the interview account (which provides evidence of the perspectives of particular groups), with the more positivistic
concerns of those similar to Brown and Sime (1981) who claim that, "An account is neither naive or an apology for behaviour, but must be taken as an informed statement by the person whose experiences are under investigation" (p160).

The realist approach also accommodates the ethnomethodological position of Garfinkel (1967) who argues that accounts are part of the world they describe, since the realist perspective recognises that in studying accounts the researcher is studying displays of cultural particulars as well as a display of members artful practices in assembling these same practices, since interview data can be treated as nothing less, but also as nothing more, than displays of reality.

This realist perspective implies that social structures are 'real' in the sense that they are reflected in social relationships which may be hidden from (though expressed in) the perceptions of the individual. Therefore, interview data displays cultural realities which are neither biased or inaccurate, but simply 'real'. Interview data is not just 'one side of the picture' to be balanced by observation (this is included for other reasons, as explained in Chapter 6) of what the respondents actually do, or to be compared with what role partners say. Instead, realism implies that such data reproduces and articulates cultural particulars grounded in given patterns of social organization.
By separating the question of the 'truth' or 'falsity' of peoples beliefs as currently assessed, from the analysis of those beliefs as social phenomenon and treating them both as 'real', it allows for participant knowledge to be treated as both a *resource* and a *topic*. This allows us to deal with accounts produced by others on the same terms as our own, whilst avoiding relativism. However, the starting point for such a venture must involve a rejection of the mistaken conceptions within both the positivistic and naturalistic paradigms of certain schools of thought, whereby only false beliefs can be explained sociologically.

It needs to be said that in claiming that interview data display cultural realities, which are neither biased or accurate but simply real, the intention is not to imply that bias and accuracy are not problems, but that these arise only in the analysis of data, and not in the form and content of the data, except in so far as the participants are troubled by bias or accuracy. This allows us to get the problem of bias in perspective, since whatever the 'techniques' used the researcher cannot escape from the fact that the interview is a social episode in its own right, and carries with it certain qualities which interfere with the collection of 'pure' data, that is, there is an essential reflexivity to all accounts no matter how 'neutral' the researcher tries to become. As Silverman (1973) realises, accounts will always be influenced by the researcher-respondent relationship since it is a product of the episode in which they meet, an episode recognised by both parties as an 'interview'.
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In this sense the methodological obsession with excluding 'interference' can best be seen as an overreaction, since the problem is not unique to interviews but is a universal feature of the research methods within the social sciences. As Denscombe (1983) reminds us, the reflexivity of accounts need pose no intractable problems for precise and productive research. He notes;

"......it is possible to use interviews in a way which both recognises the reflexivity of accounts and uses this reflexivity to good purpose - indeed which capitalises on the intrinsic properties of interviews as social episodes." (Denscombe, 1983, p121)

The important point is that, **interviews evoke accounts**, and whilst this is a common feature of peoples normal activity, the uniqueness of interviews is in the extent of their demand for accountability, and the way in which the expectation of a need to provide an account forms part and parcel of the episode. As Silverman (1973) puts it;

"In their accounting activities members concern themselves with displaying what will currently be understood as rational grounds for past actions and as rational explanations of past social scenes, i.e. they seek to display their purported 'sensible' and 'rational' character." (Silverman, 1973, p44)

To display such rationality the respondent must provide, (1) a description of relevant views, events and situations, and (2) a justification of these views, events and situations. Thus the interview stimulates the respondents to describe and justify their opinions, activities, and interpretation of events, thereby demonstrating the reasoning involved without jeopardizing the naturalness of the setting.
Within the realist perspective as has been outlined, the centrality of accounts as 'real' obviously places less emphasis on the 'truth' of the content, and centres more upon a perspectives analysis, of which the case studies of Voysey (1975) and Baruch (1982) on the families of handicapped children are good examples. The study by Voysey (1975) indicates clearly how suspected misrepresentations in the content of accounts, which from a positivistic frame would invalidate them, can actually be used to look for deep rooted consistencies. Based on her own study she argues that in accounting for the influence of a handicapped child on their family life, the parents do in fact draw upon their conception of normal family life to give the 'false' impression that they have been unaffected.

"(Parents) maintain a normal respectable appearance because they make situationally appropriate use of the normal family in formulating particular accounts of their activities. 'The family' defines the situation in which the giving of an account is appropriate." (Voysey, 1975, p56)

In attempting to present an image of normality, the parents have to draw on their conceptions of 'normal' family life in accounting for their activities to the interviewer. Consequently, the validity of their depiction in such a case is less significant than the representation of what constitutes normal family life embedded in the account. In discussing such a perspectives analysis Denscombe (1983) notes;

"...to expose a line of reasoning hidden beneath surface representations - the issue of validity alters somewhat. For the researcher it is not the extent to which the content is accurate which is so important, as the extent to which it represents the forms of practical reasoning employed by members." (Denscombe, 1983, p120)
The Branstown Study conducted interviews within such a realist framework and by utilising a grounded theory analysis attempted to focus on the practical reasoning and the practical knowledge displayed as perspectives. These perspectives were made evident and articulated in relation to their opposites within the department, in accounts both formal and informal, and provided the researcher with valuable insights into the teachers' understanding of their world, which was seen as essential in contextualising their concerns over the proposed innovations.

(5.4) NOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE.

1. See Glaser and Strauss (1967), and Glaser (1978). This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7.
2. See Stenhouse (1978) for a full consideration of the role of the 'oral historian'.
4. This is dealt with in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER SIX

ON THE USE OF OBSERVATION
(6.1) OBSERVATION - PARTICIPANT OR OTHERWISE?

The Branstown Study combined reflexive interviewing with observation as an interactive strategy within the naturalistic paradigm to gain access to the world of the physical educators. Concerning the advantages of direct observation Guba and Lincoln (1981) note:

"The basic methodological arguments for observation, then, may be summarized as these: observation maximises the inquirer's ability to grasp motives, beliefs, concerns, interests, unconscious behaviours, customs and the like; observation allows the inquirer to see the world as his subjects see it, to live in their time frames, to capture the phenomenon in and of its own terms, and to grasp the culture in its own natural ongoing environment; observation provides the inquirer with access to the emotional reactions of the group introspectively - that is, in a real sense it permits the observer to use himself as a data source; and observation allows the listener to build up tacit knowledge, both his own and that of members of the group." (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, p193)

Similarly, Frankenberg (1982) recommends a spell of participant observation for all sociologists since, "It gives you an idea of interaction and the inter-relationships of social relations in a group, a sense of which you cannot get in any other way" (p52). This term is, however, vague and ambiguous, for example, Denzin (1970) defines participant observation as;

"...a strategy that simultaneously combines document analysis, respondent and informant interviewing, direct participation and observation and introspection." (Denzin, 1970, p186)
As mentioned observation and interviews were the dominant methodologies in the Branstown Study, although a basic form of documentary analysis was utilised in terms of assisting researcher interpretation, as an example, the letter Alex sent to the Headmaster to justify more scale points in the department was analysed as part of a theoretical sampling procedure to focus on the micropolitical strategy that Alex was formulating to enhance subject status. In terms of the forms of participation and observation available, a multitude of field roles are potentially available, and both Gold (1958) and Junker (1960) have distinguished between 'complete participant', 'participant-as-observer', 'observer-as-participant', and 'complete observer'.

Aspects of each of these roles were considered for their advantages and disadvantages in terms of the research aspirations of the study prior to the researcher engaging in negotiating access to the school. In the 'complete participant' role the researcher's activities are concealed, that is, covert, with a good example being Rosenhahn's (1982) study of a mental hospital, where he entered as an 'ordinary member' with a view to conducting research. Similarly, 'complete participation' may occur when the researcher is already a member of the group he choses to study, for example, Holdaway's (1982) research on the police, and Roth's (1963) on a tuberculosis ward where he was a real patient. Again both are forms of covert research in which 'passing' as a member, or 'becoming' a member is essential. These roles were not adopted in the Branstown Study since as a research strategy in relation to the overall
research aspirations, they were considered limiting and restrictive in terms of the range and character of data that could be collected.

As Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) realise;

"The participant will, by definition, be implicated in existing social practices and expectations in a far more rigid manner than the known researcher. The research activity will therefore be hedged round by these pre-existing social routines and realities. It will prove hard for the field-worker to arrange his or her actions in order to optimize data collection possibilities. Some potentially fruitful lines of inquiry may be rendered practically impossible, in so far as the complete participant has to react in accordance with existing role expectations." (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983, p95)

For reasons similar to the above Pollert (1981) in her study of female factory workers, made a definite decision not to take a full-time job in the factory.

"Had I got a job, the advantages of experiencing for myself what it felt like, and possibly becoming very close to a small work group around me, would have been heavily outweighed by the disadvantages of restricted movement, abiding by the rules preventing entry into other departments (without permission), and losing the privileges of the outsider, of speaking to other employees in the factory, including chargehands, supervisors, and managers." (Pollert, 1981, p6)

However, some of the most influential studies on schooling conducted by Hargreaves (1967), Lacey (1967), Ball (1981a), and Burgess (1983), have adopted the role of teacher in the schools involved in the studies, and in a sense were confined by such roles in them, even though they were openly acknowledged by the staff as 'researcher' engaged in 'open' research. In the Branstown Study, due to the time limitations and the restricted employment opportunities in the county it would not have been possible to secure a teaching post at the school, whilst the alternative of acting as a supply teacher in
the school would not have guaranteed continuous contact with those in the physical education department. More importantly, since a central research aspiration of the present study was to focus on the multiple realities of the physical educators, freedom of movement was seen as essential for engagement in theoretical sampling, which involved observing the same teachers in different contexts as and when emergent concerns became evident and needed focusing upon. Freedom to move around within the department was also critical since on entry the researcher did not have a hypothesis to 'test', and was therefore in no position to begin focusing on events at that early stage.

At the other extreme the role of complete observer was also rejected since it suffers from many of the disadvantages of complete participation, as in both cases, due to constraints inherent in the role, the researcher is unable to interact with the members being studied as a researcher. This places limitations on what can be observed, although all roles have some limitations in this sense, and the questioning of participants to promote researcher insight and understanding of their perspectives becomes extremely difficult. In addition, adopting this role by itself would make it more difficult to generate substantive theory in relation to the constructions used by the participants, since theoretical sampling would be inhibited.

The role adopted in the Branstown Study was in Gan's(1982) terminology that of 'researcher participant', in which the researcher
participates in the social situation, but is personally and partially involved, and has the leeway to adopt a variety of roles as required. During the study the researcher role fluctuated between complete-participant when playing for the staff football team, to complete-observer, when standing at the side of the sports hall watching a lesson in progress. At other times, such as, making tea at breaktimes, or handing out valuables to the pupils at the beginning and end of lessons, these roles fall between the two, and are difficult to locate with precision due to the fluid nature of movement between roles in this form of research. Indeed no clear distinctions should be sought, since as Turner (1962) reminds us, roles can just as easily be 'made' as 'taken', and in opting to alleviate the staff of certain 'arduous' tasks, such as giving out the valuables, pumping up the netballs or footballs, and collecting kit, the researcher explicitly created the role of 'helper' during certain phases of the study to facilitate interaction with the teachers and gain their confidence.

(6.2) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OBSERVATION AND INTERVIEWS.

In the Branstown Study observation and interviews were seen to inform each other, and this relationship needs to be clarified. Denscombe (1983) proposes that the use of observation and interviews in a major means of overcoming threats to the 'validity' of members' accounts, and suggests that interviews should follow observation of the teacher in a number of different classroom situations, and "as a minimum, the teacher should not be interviewed without being
observed in action" (p118). However, such a notion is constricting in several ways as it would disallow the use of 'biographical interviews' since it would be impossible to 'observe' the teacher in situations that may have occurred several years ago. Denscombe's (1983) concern for observation as a 'check' on accounts is clearly related to the 'information' perspective outlined earlier where observation provides;

"Some rather crude yardstick to compare the account of the activity with the 'apparent reality' of the classroom situation. It prevents the grossest form of distortion where the teacher could present an impression of classroom activity quite at variance with the actual situation." (Denscombe, 1983, p118)

Since the researcher had seen the physical educators teach various lessons and observed their interactions in the staffroom and departmental area at Branstown School, it would have been more difficult for them to produce a 'false' representation, but even if they had this would have provided a rich source of data and not a source of invalidation. As noted, accounts at Branstown School were viewed as evidence of 'perspectives', which from a realist stance are neither true nor false, but real. Hence, observation was seen as essential in 'contextualising' the questions and issues discussed in interviews as suggested by Hargreaves et al (1975), since by having seen and been part of the teacher's world over an extended period of time, the questions asked in interview were able to direct accounts to actual events (often witnessed by both teacher and researcher) rather than vague, hypothetical abstract events. In this sense, observation gives the researcher the option of centring on 'practical' or 'matters of principle', the former involving in
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Keddie's (1971) terms a 'classroom' perspective, and the latter an 'educationalist' perspective. Also, by relating the account directly to events in the staffroom and classroom of which the teacher is a part, the teacher accounts become 'grounded in the real world as experienced by him/her, and provides for the illumination of potential links between their actions and their individual ideals, values, and beliefs.

Observations at Branstown School, therefore, were not utilised as a means to invalidate accounts, but to allow the researcher to develop a deeper contextual knowledge to inform his interpretation of teacher accounts and activities, which allowed for the development of second order constructs that were then subjected to theoretical sampling. It needs to be made explicit that this was not an attempt to 'triangulate' methods as proposed by Denzin (1970), in which triangulation is seen to overcome the partial views of the members by providing a representation of something like the 'complete picture', since it was precisely the partial and incomplete views of the teachers which had to be understood by the researcher in order for him to interpret their reactions to the innovations. Halfpenny (1979) has illustrated the positivistic assumptions behind such notions of method triangulation, which seeks to obtain reliable measures of mental states and social events, as the researcher bias is eliminated and he/she converges on some absolute 'truth'. However, as Dingwell (1981) makes clear, the sociologists role is not to adjudicate between participants competing versions of reality, but to
understand the situated work they do in allowing the individual to operate in social life.

This is not to imply that the researcher should avoid generating data in multiple ways as long as it is principled and conducive to process resonance, since this can often serve as a useful reminder of the situated character of much of the action, plus multiple sources of data assist in producing layers of understanding for the researcher as he/she remains in the field over time. Multiple forms of data are not to be used to adjudicate between accounts, since to do so would reduce the researcher role to what Garfinkel (1967) describes as an 'ironist', in which one account is used to undercut another, whilst the researcher remains blind to both the reality of the account and the particular constructs that emerge, and to the sense of each account as it arises in context. Hence in the Branstown Study the researcher made no attempt to judge which account was the most 'correct' for what happened in relation to the innovations, since this would have been to deny the teachers' their own realities which were the central focus of the study.

(6.3) FAMILIARITY - A CRITICAL ISSUE IN OBSERVATION.

In the earlier studies of Ball (1981a) and Burgess (1983) the researchers became teachers in the school, and each acknowledges that they utilised their former teacher status as a base from which to conduct research. In this sense, whilst they were 'outsiders' initially in their particular research schools, they were familiar
with schools, teachers, pupils and the general operations that take place within schools. Burgess (1983) suggests that such familiarity can be turned to the researchers' advantage, and this was certainly true in the Branstown Study, where the status of the researcher as a physical education specialist capable of assisting competently when required, teaching physical education as a supply teacher (during the study) in some of the 'harder' schools in the city, and having sporting contacts in the area, enabled him to enter the department as a 'comrade in arms'.

At Branstown School the researcher was seen as an 'insider' in terms of the subculture of physical education, but an 'outsider' in terms of 'this is how things are done at this school'. Burgess (1984) considers the various traditions and perspectives that researchers have used in the study of their own society, and notes:

"Some sociologists have remained 'outsiders' some have been 'insiders' often through force of circumstance, whilst others have simultaneously been both an outsider and insider within the same situation." (Burgess, 1984, p20)

In his consideration of the differing models of field research used by sociologists and social anthropologists to engage in contemporary field research, such as, the 'going native', 'undercover', and the 'advocate' models, he notes that a problem identified in all of them is the situation when the researcher is familiar with the societies or groups under study. This 'familiarity' has led Leach (1963) to be sceptical as to just how far a sociologist can go in understanding his/her own society, and Schon (1983) notes
the monotony of routine activities and the "selective inattention" (p46) that it creates. Similarly Rudduck (1985a) notes the problem of the familiarity of the classroom to teachers when attempting to engage them in 'teacher research', since:

"The everyday eyes of teachers have two weaknesses: because of the dominance of habit and routine teachers are only selectively attentive to the phenomena of their classrooms. In a sense they are constantly restructuring the world they are familiar with in order to maintain regularities and routines. Secondly, because of their business their eyes tend only to transcribe the surface realities of classroom interaction." (Rudduck, 1985a, p125)

By adopting the role of researcher-participant in the Branstown Study the 'business' was partially overcome, but there was a concern that with five years experience of teaching physical education in comprehensive schools the researcher would find himself in the position that Becker (1971) describes in terms of his fellow researchers in schools;

"It takes a tremendous effort of will and imagination to stop seeing only those things that are conventionally 'there' to be seen, I have talked to a couple of teams of research people who have sat around in classrooms trying to observe, and it is like pulling teeth to get them to see or write anything beyond what 'everybody' knows." (Becker, 1971, p10)

To overcome this familiarity problem the researcher needs to become a 'stranger' in Shutz's (1962) terms, since as Merton (1972) notes, "it is the stranger....who finds what is familiar to the group significantly unfamiliar, and so is prompted to raise questions for inquiry less apt to be raised by insiders" (p33). Becoming a stranger is relatively easy if one is working with certain 'exotic' groups contained within a pluralist society such as drug addicts,
prostitutes, and extremist religious groups since the researcher (unless already a member of these groups) will tend to experience an immediate process of estrangement known as 'culture shock', forcing him/her to look at the situation anew. Schooling did not provide this culture shock in the present study and the researcher had to engage in a determined attempt to make the 'common' seem 'strange'.

Those within the phenomenological tradition have attempted to overcome the problem of familiarity by utilising the 'phenomenological reduction' or 'epoche' as proposed by Husserl(1970). He suggested that to reach the 'untarnished truth' one must suspend or 'bracket' what he called the 'natural attitude', that is, the ordinary cognitive posture we adopt to the everyday world in which we are naively immersed leading to unquestioned acceptance of daily events. This notion was developed by Schutz(1962,1967) in his view of verstehen and the production of second order constructs, in which the former becomes a first order process by which we all interpret the world, and a second order process by which the researcher interprets and understands the first order process. Hence, as the second order constructs are built up the researcher is able to adopt a theoretic posture to the everyday world, which Schutz(1962) claims involves a "leap into the province of theoretical thought involving the resolution of the individual to suspend his subjective point of view"(p24). This leap assists in bracketing away the private, pragmatic concerns of everyday life to ensure that the 'insider' researcher does not get swamped in the taken for grantedness of the situation he/she is in.
Stephenson and Greer (1981) claim that the researcher needs to adopt an artificial 'naivety' to aid such bracketing, and advise that the researcher record as much detail about the people present and the topics of conversation, regardless of their relevance, in order that they may be reflexively studied on leaving the field. This naivety was adopted at Branstown School and field notes were literal descriptions of events and lessons, and where the researcher wished to raise questions these were recorded in brackets to indicate they were not the views of the participants. In a similar fashion Bogdan and Bilken (1982) suggest the researcher in a familiar setting should move away from abstract descriptions in their field notes and provide specific details of what was said and done, in order that later analysis outside of the action can force the events to be questioned in future observation sessions. The use of a reflexive diary was also helpful in forcing the researcher to consider the happenings he has witnessed and raised issues concerning his own taken for grantedness in operation, and this also assisted in generating second order constructs. In addition this diary enables the researcher to monitor when he feels he is 'noticing nothing', and needs to leave the field for a period of consolidation and reflection, and this situation was faced several times at Branstown School despite the researcher being only present a maximum of two days per week, indicating the stress involved in making the familiar strange within the research process. The researcher being involved in other forms of employment not related to teaching was also beneficial in creating a 'stranger' perspective on events, plus his experiences in many different types of schools and with different
subjects when acting as a supply teacher allowed for many comparisons to be made between schools and subjects, again helping to combat the problem of routinisation for the observer.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE GUIDING FRAME OF GROUNDED THEORY
(7.1) CONCEPTIONS OF GROUNDED THEORY AS LOCALISED AND PATTERNED.

The data collection methods and the resulting interpretations within the dynamic procedure of the research act at Branstown School were guided by the grounded theory approach of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Glaser (1978). Since in grounded theory the theory follows from the data, rather than preceding it, then it was seen as the 'natural' approach in view of the paradigmatic assumptions. In addition the study was primarily concerned with discovering concepts and working hypotheses relevant to emergent issues, rather than testing a prespecified theory, and may be seen as an attempt to redress the balance within a physical education research tradition dominated by verificational studies. As such, it is part of a reaction against grand theory and extreme empiricism which stimulated the development of grounded theory in the late 1960's as it sought to bridge the gap between theoretically uninformed empirical research and empirically-uninformed theory by grounding theory in data. However, as Bulmer (1984) notes, in many respects the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) is more a rhetorical evocation of qualitative research than a clear and tightly written specification, and Woods (1985) claims that despite its influence on data analysis, British ethnographic research over the last decade has failed to reach its promise in the area of theory.
Just what grounded theory is remains open to researcher interpretation. Glaser and Strauss (1967) indicate that a grounded theory is one that will;

"...fit the situation researched, and work when put into use. By fit we mean that the categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under study; by 'work' we mean that they are meaningfully relevant to and able to explain the behaviour under study." (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p3)

Therefore, 'work' and 'fit' are essential in a grounded approach, whilst Elden (1981) in his discussion of 'participatory' research suggests that grounded theory needs to be 'local', in that it draws together the aggregate of local, isolated and individualised understandings to form a systematised local theory, which without the intervention of the researcher would have remained isolated, and possibly tacit, thereby remaining at the level of 'folklore' or 'conventional wisdom'. Linked to this conception of local, is the view of pattern models of explanation as outlined by Reason (1981) in his discussion of Diesing's (1972) work.

"The information that is gathered in the field situation is used by the wholist to build a model which serves both to describe and explain the system. The model is built by [quoting Diesing] 'connecting themes in a network or a pattern'(p155); the connections may be of various kinds, but they are 'discovered empirically rather than inferred logically'(p156); the result of this is an empirical account of the whole system. This account explains the system because it describes the relationships the various parts have for each other, so that 'the relationship between the part and other parts serve to explain and interpret the meaning of that part'(p158). This type of explanation is called a pattern model of explanation." (Reason, 1981, p185)

Concerning the 'objectivity' of such pattern models, Kaplan (1964) claims this consists of the ability of the pattern to be infinitely
filled out and extended, as more and more knowledge is obtained and falls into place within the pattern, as the place of the pattern itself becomes clearer as part of the larger whole. The interpretations of the Branstown Study are then local and patterned, and capable of extension, whilst grounded firmly in the realities of those teachers in the school, and is therefore markedly different from the deductive model of explanation.

The deductive model involves general laws which explain some phenomenon, whilst the pattern model involves a number of phenomena of equal importance, and tries to explain the connections between them, for instance, at Branstown School the low status of physical education as a subject was seen to be connected to the development and use of a coping strategy by the physical educators classified as 'rhetorical justification'. Secondly, the deduction of unknown parts from known parts is not possible in the pattern model, and prediction was not seen as a priority in the present study, since explanation was seen to lie in demonstrating the connections of puzzling events with other events and the whole pattern of the innovation, for instance, the rejection of a chance for promotion by Simon in 1986 is seen as related to his career aspirations within Branstown School to move into the pastoral system, which is itself connected to his concern with the ageing process and injuries as a physical educator, both of which are interlinked to his recent remarriage and birth of his first child. This form of pattern model is rarely if ever 'finished', and is subject to change in the course of its development as new data and possible interpretations become
available, and in this sense the researcher interpretation of the Branstown Study is open ended, and can be extended indefinitely.

This is not to deny that the findings of the Branstown Study can be used to predict and generate specific hypotheses for testing in other studies, such as, the development of the pragmatic coping strategy involving a strategic rhetoric in relation to the innovation, may be formulated as a working hypothesis concerning marginal subjects in schools and their utilisation of innovations. In relation to such a development the work of Andy Hargreaves (1981) on the uses of contrastive rhetoric to maintain and define the permissible practice of teachers is a good example. Concerning the concept of 'contrastive rhetoric' he notes;

"...is in part derived from research on interactional practices among professional groups and from the sociology of mass media and deviance; but in the main it is a grounded concept (Glaser and Strauss, 1968) formulated.....as the most satisfactory method I could evolve of explaining the data to hand." (Hargreaves, A, 1981, p218)

This concept is both testable and useful for testing other theories, such as, the confirmation or refutation of the hegemony thesis. However, it tends to be of a cumulative nature in its form of testing and Hargreaves (1981) claims that much more research is required before any degree of certainty can be appreciated. In a similar fashion the concept of 'rhetorical justification' as developed in the Branstown Study is testable, and could well be substantiated and extended in future studies involving the adoption of health related fitness modules, and training and vocational
educational initiatives (TVEI) within physical education, it simply remains beyond the scope of the present study to undertake this testing.

(7.2) PATTERNS AND THE MOSAIC OF REALITY — THE PLACE OF THEORY DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING IN THE RESEARCH PROCESS.

The Branstown Study was predominantly concerned with discovery rather than the testing of concepts, and within this framework the notion of patterns emerging from the data is central since it allows for the synthesis of description and theorising. As Ball (1983) notes;

"The analysis of case-study data is essentially concerned with the process of interpretation, that is the translation of raw data into a coherent portrayal of an institution and of institutional processes. The process of interpretation involves the data coming to stand for and represent a field of reality as a basis for a 'theoretical' (or some other kind of) account of the setting." (Ball, 1983, p96)

This reflects the concern of the present study in its attempt to portray the realities of those involved in change, in which theory is intimately linked to the process of constructing the picture of reality, with different studies offering different slices of reality, complementing each other in a manner similar to the pieces of a mosaic fitting together. This is based on Becker's (1970) consideration of the work of the Chicago School of ethnographers and their use of case studies, in which he notes;

"In doing so, they partially complete a mosaic of great complexity and detail, with the city itself as the subject, a 'case' which could be used to test a variety of themes and in
which the interconnections of a host of seemingly unrelated phenomena could be seen, however imperfectly." (Becker,1970,p66)

Such a mosaic model of theory building has been criticised by Hammersley(1985) and Hammersley et al(1985), who feel that to conceptualise theories as describing the world so that each study adds another bit to the picture, is fundamentally misleading. They do recognise, however, that the provision of a descriptive/explanatory account of a particular setting or sequence of events is very different from the development and testing of theory about some aspect of that setting or sequence, and that both can rarely be completed within the scope of a single study, even though they feel this is desirable. Becker(1970) is also critical of the 'single study' paradigm, in which any given study is expected to develop and test theory in its own right. By contrasting Hammersley's(1985) conception of theory with that contained in the Branstown Study, the latter is made clearer in its location. Within Hammersley's(1985)' framework;

"...the focus is not on given events, but rather on a particular theoretical idea, and those aspects of any events whose investigations might facilitate the development and testing of that idea.....In this model, theories do not describe the world; they are not accounts of the relations between events in a particular setting, or descriptions of the interrelation of social structures in a society, or models of the causes of a phenomenon. They are not empirical generalisations of any kind. Rather they are statements of some of the general principles which generate socio-historical events." (Hammersley,1985,p247)

In contrast in the Branstown Study, the focus was on a particular event, or set of events, the aim being to describe and explain as many aspects as possible. In order to do this the researcher
utilised theoretical ideas in an eclectic manner by drawing from several fields of inquiry, as he attempted to identify and relate to each other the multiple influences interacting in the social environment of Branstown School with regards to the proposals for curriculum innovation within the physical education department. Essentially what was involved was the development, application, and elaboration of theoretical ideas in order to formulate a plausible interpretation of the phenomenon of innovation within the physical education department. The testing of the concepts developed is specifically left to future studies, and the Branstown Study should be seen as a Phase 1 inquiry according to the following classification outlined by Almeder (1980) who suggests that the process of theoretical inquiry can be reconstructed in three phases:

1) The development of plausible explanatory ideas for puzzling phenomena.

2) One of the plausible explanations generated in stage one is clarified and developed into a theory having implications for other cases. This is a deductive stage of inquiry involving a classification of concepts and the derivation of hypotheses about what one would expect to occur under various circumstances if the theory were correct.

3) The selection and investigation of cases in which these various hypotheses can be tested.

Clearly then, many studies will be located in Phase 1, the Branstown Study included, and later studies will hopefully take, for instance, the concept of rhetorical justification into Phase 2, and eventually test it by using critical case studies in Phase 3. Woods (1985) also notes that studies need not begin in Phase 1, but use existing ethnographic studies as a launching pad to develop testable
constructs, and Hammersley (1979) indicates how grounded theory can be used to 'fill-in' existing theory and begin to formulate it. In this sense the work of Pollard (1982) may be considered a Phase 2 study, since in considering the work of Andy Hargreaves (1978a, 1978b) on coping strategies contained within a 'macro' framework, he realised there was an imbalance which he attempted to redress by focusing upon the subjective meanings of coping, in order to pull the relevant influences together in a theoretical model. However, this theoretical model has yet to be tested explicitly (a Phase 3 activity), and it may be too complex to be of great theoretical use in its present form.

The Branstown Study is located early on in a cumulative sequence, which is exploratory and generative in terms of theory, a Phase 1 activity, with its own appropriate levels of abstraction. Concept generation and theoretical purchase were enhanced by the researcher being sensitised to a wide range of disciplines, allowing plausible explanatory ideas to account for the process of innovation at Branstown School, as Glaser (1978) claims;

"Accordingly, the theory is rooted in the data not on an existing body of theory. Later as generating continues, comparisons with extant theory may link it to a number of diverse theories which touch upon various aspects and levels of emerging theory. This linkage, at a minimum, can place the generated theory within a body of existing theories. More often, as we have said, it transcends part of it while integrating several extant theories. It may shed new perspectives and understandings on other theories and highlight their process. Other theories are neither proved or disproved, they are placed, extended and broadened." (Glaser, 1978, p38)
(7.3) ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF CHOOSING A GROUNDED THEORY APPROACH.

As stated, the Branstown Study was primarily concerned with generation and discovery, rather than testing. Hammersley (1985) implies that grounded theorising is primarily concerned with development, and analytical induction the testing of theory, similarly, Bulmer (1984) suggests that grounded theory may be more successful in generating concepts than in generating testable hypotheses, and that in common with analytical induction, its very success in improving categorisation seems to inhibit movement to verification. Brown (1973) makes the critical point in his suggestion as to why Glaser and Strauss (1967) seem to avoid concerns for methodological issues, yet feel safe with the resulting theory when he claims that this is not because the theory is grounded in data, but because it is grounded in a certain type of data, where at times it may well be possible for the researcher to get a sense of causal links and influences between events by direct observation and interviewing. However, with regards to some phenomena, such as Brown's (1973) own study of schizophrenic patients, the prevailing conditions are more discontinuous in both time and space, and in the level of the system studied. In this case, close contact with the phenomenon may not produce much in the way of theory, at least one that can be held with any confidence, or if theory is developed, alternative explanations may come readily to mind that cannot be settled by the researcher's greater immersion in the situation.
The concerns of Brown (1973) and Williams (1976) highlight the point that the grounded theory approach may not be suitable for all studies and situations. The potential match between situation and theory generation requires considerable thought, since not all phenomena lend themselves to intensive study by drawing upon the members accounts. As Brown (1973) points out:

"The type of material best given to the development of grounded theory - in the sense of theory that can be held with considerable assurance without formal testing - is that closely associated with the classificatory kind of activity or some kinds of processual analysis as outlined earlier. It tends to involve relatively short term processes, sequences of behaviour that are directly observable or can be reported on, and behaviour which has a repetitive character. Something missed can often be observed again. This kind of data can lead to considerable assurance about what is going on, and a not entirely unjustified impatience with methodological niceties." (Brown, 1973, p8)

In terms of the above description the school situation and the innovation at Branstown School seem to match well, however, the Branstown Study was interested in methodological niceties as indicated in the earlier chapters, in order to enhance the credibility of the findings.

(7.4) REJECTING THE MIND AS TABULA RASA.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) imply the researcher is best served by entering the field with the mind as tabula rasa, whereby the literature is ignored in order to ensure that the emergence of categories is not contaminated by concepts more suitable to other areas, and point out that similarities and convergences may be
established after the analytical core of categories has emerged. In relation to the emergence of categories they seem to claim that the chicken and the egg can be separated, but logically such a claim is doubtful, and Glaser (1978) seems to have modified his position significantly, claiming;

"Sensitivity is necessarily increased by being steeped in the literature that deals with both kinds of variables and their associated general ideas that will be used. Thus the analyst's sensitivity, while predominantly of a single field and an area or two within it, is surely not so limited. By familiarity with ways of constructing variables in other fields he may imbue his theory in a multivariate fashion that touches many fields." (Glaser, 1978, p3)

The same author notes that the researcher needs to avoid logically deducted a priori hypotheses on entry to the field, in order to remain 'open' to the data, and reduce the chances of forcing theoretical square pegs into round holes due to pre-existing hypotheses and 'biases'. This still leaves the emergence of concepts as problematic, and it is more realistic to assume that all research begins with some problem or set of issues which concern the researcher, what Malinowski (1922) called 'foreshadowed problems'. As Hanson (1958) notes, "people, not their eyes, see. Cameras, and eyeballs are blind" (p6), implying that theory free description is a misplaced objective, and Jones (1985) in discussing her own grounded theory work notes;

"But the analysis of data about the social world can never be 'merely' a matter of discovering and describing what there is. The very process of deducing 'what is', and what is relevant and significant in 'what is', involves selective interpretation and conceptualisation." (Jones, 1985, p57)
Similarly, Bulmer (1984) recognises the constant interplay between the observation of realities and the formation of concepts, between research and theorising, and between perception and explanation. This interactive concept describes well the process of operation in the Branstown Study where the author entered the field sensitised to the literature on role theory, negotiations, and strategies etc, along with his expectations based on five years teaching experience. However, the focus on the process of innovation could not be foreseen on entry to the field and truly was an emergent issue with the department once Alex had decided he required change. As a consequence the literature on innovation was only covered on leaving the field in July 1884, and was part of an intensive retrospective analysis which was coupled with ongoing interviews with the physical educators at Branstown School up until September 1986. In relation to the researcher interpretation of emergent concerns and micropolitical solutions as outlined in later chapters, every attempt is made at the beginning of each chapter to make explicit the theoretical base from which researcher interpretations were drawn.

7.5 ON THE INTERACTION BETWEEN INDUCTION AND DEDUCTION.

Grounded theory is generated predominantly by inductive forms of data analysis, in which the researcher attempts to keep an 'open' mind, and the research design is not tightly structured in accordance with a priori theory or a set of variables for testing, since these are expected to emerge from the data. However, inductive theory formation is not without its problems or its critics, with
the main issue centring around the notion of 'underdetermination'. Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim this is the "curse of inductive logic" (p207), since it can be challenged on the grounds that any given set of facts is always open to multiple interpretation. Thus concerning the 'weaknesses' of induction in grounded theory, Ford (1975) notes:

"Certainly there are some funny bunnies who, like Glaser and Strauss, will try to seduce you into a Tiggywinkle world of dirty smalls. These furry fellows believe unflinchingly in liberated LAUNDARY; so much so that they keep flaunting their theory-construction procedures before you. Indeed, they may even attempt to lure you into that streamy backroom of the mind where they spend many sweaty hours chanting the four principle modes of John Stuart Mill's inductive methodology.....These strategies for theory construction are still found in most textbooks on sociological methodology. But you have my personal guarantee that if you try to emulate them you will get nothing but hot and sticky......so do not be bamboozled into the steamroom of routinized induction." (Ford, 1975, p221)

Unfortunately, the criticisms of underdetermination can be levelled at any theory, whether it is arrived at inductively or deductively, and Quine (1953) has argued that no theory is ever logically determined by data. Every act of theory development whether grounded or a priori, is creative in nature, going well beyond the empirical data or conceptual imaginings that suggested it. Equally, no process is ever completely reliant upon either induction or deduction, and in terms of Goetz and Le Compte's (1981) inductive-deductive dimension, the researcher at Branstown School was constantly moving back and forth, there being a constant interplay between the two. The balance changed depending upon the particular phase of research, and as Lachenmeyer (1971) points out, "Theories are not developed deductively or inductively, but both deductively
and inductively" (p61). Glaser (1978) clearly claims a place for deduction in grounded theory, again noting the need for balance:

"Maintaining the balance between the two logics and following their interplay is dictated by whether the research is initiated primarily as deductive (derived or preconceived) or as inductive. Grounded theory, is of course inductive; a theory is induced or emerges after data collection starts. Deductive work in grounded theory is used to derive from induced codes conceptual guides as to where to go next for which comparative group or sub-group, in order to sample for more data to generate theory." (Glaser, 1978, p90)

As an example, from early interview data the code of 'teacher demonstration ability as central to role' was induced, and then a deductive process became activated in order to identify and locate which activities the teachers found difficult to demonstrate in order that these lessons could be observed, which would lead to further induction based on the happenings in the class. Hence the process is a continuous cycle, and the research act at Branstown School was always contained within this interplay between induction and deduction and the 'ground in between'.

(7.6) THEORETICAL SAMPLING.

Glaser (1978) proposes that the distinguishing feature of the grounded theory approach is that the researcher is constantly involved in interpreting the data, both during fieldwork, and after the data is collected, and guiding and controlling this constant process of interpretation is the notion of 'theoretical sampling'. The majority of the literature on sampling focuses on statistical sampling, and the basic distinction between probability and non-
probability sampling, in contrast Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest that researchers make use of theoretical sampling;

"Theoretical sampling is the process of data collection for generating theory whereby the analyst jointly collects, codes, and analyses his data and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges. This process is controlled by the emerging theory." (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p45)

Denzin (1970) has identified two approaches to sampling that he defines as non-interactive and interactive sampling. The former involves statistically rigorous samples using variables, whilst the latter involves the analysis of 'natural' behaviour', of which theoretical sampling is a form. Concerning the two he notes:

(1) Theoretical sampling does not end until new concepts and categories no longer appear, while statistical sampling ends when a predetermined sample has been observed.

(2) Theoretical sampling is judged by the quality of theory, while statistical sampling is judged by the extent to which it conforms to the rules of sampling theory.

Whilst, Lincoln and Guba (1985) in their discussion of 'purposive sampling' which is synonymous with theoretical sampling, note the following characteristics; (1) emergent sampling design, (2) serial selection of sample units, (3) continuous adjustments of 'focusing' on the sample, and (4) selection to the point of redundancy. Smith and Pohland (1976) consider this approach to be one of the most significant contributions to field research since the notion of theoretical sampling is seen to formalise activities which they consider important in field studies, such as, having enough evidence,
having enough data in a particular area, and deciding when to move on to other related problems.

Selection in terms of theoretical sampling allows particular categories to emerge out of the data as it is gathered, allowing the researcher to develop, extend, and modify working hypotheses and concepts. As an example, in the Branstown Study the conceptualisation of 'demonstration ability as central to role' emerged early on in the analysis of interview data. The researcher then selected certain lessons in which he knew that demonstrations would be problematic for the teachers, such as, educational gymnastics for the men and basketball for Rachel. This then allowed the researcher to focus upon the conditions in which demonstration becomes problematic and the strategies used to overcome these by the teacher, and this led to the researcher linking 'demonstration' and 'perceived pupil ability'. With 'able' classes one of the pupils is used for demonstrations, or a verbal description of a skill may suffice, but with 'low ability' groups the reliance was on teacher demonstration to define action and outcomes (this is a teacher conceptualisation, not the pupils). Returning to these points in interview led to links being established between 'pupil ability', 'teacher demonstration ability', and 'teacher security in classroom' which itself was later linked by further observation sessions and interviews to 'pupil achievement level in terms of visible product and 'pupils as credit and debit units'. This cyclic process fed into the emergence of a the category 'teaching is achieving', which itself is located within one of the core categories to emerge in the
study that 'teaching is controlling', both of which were to have a
direct influence on the reactions of the staff to the proposed
innovations, particularly the resistance of the men to increased
educational gymnastics on the curriculum.

Such an example of theoretical sampling indicates how it forces the
researcher to confront such basic questions as; what groups, sub-
groups or individuals are to be used in the data collection? For
what purposes will they be used? When should observation sessions
and interviews take place? Which direction should the focus be next
in relation to the emerging categories? Such a strategy is clearly
distinct from statistical sampling in terms of its underlying
rationale which involves the researcher in data collection with a
view to developing, extending, modifying or verifying theory, and as
such the research act guided by grounded theory moves away from the
ideal typical research process which is characterised by
'linearity". Grounded theory is not produced in a step-by-step
fashion, instead it is a complex affair involving what Glaser(1978)
call 'double back steps';

"The steps....are collection of data, open coding of data soon
after, theoretical sampling, generating many memoes with as
much saturation as possible....which then become the basis for
more selective sampling, coding and memoing as the analyst
focuses on the case. This goes on all at once." (Glaser,1978,p16)

Theoretical sampling, then, lies at the heart of the grounded theory
approach, because the theory can only remain grounded if it is
generated on the basis of the researcher's interpretation of
previously collected data. This generation occurs through the
process of 'conceptual elaboration' which involves a deductive effort on the vertical dimension, that is, at various levels of abstraction;

"Conceptual elaboration during theoretical sampling is the systematic deduction from the emerging theory of the theoretical possibilities and probabilities for elaborating the theory as to explanations and interpretations. These become hypotheses which guide the researcher back to locations and comparative groups in the field to discover more ideas and connections from the data." (Glaser, 1978, p40)

As an example, Simon during interview commented, "Some teachers couldn't give a damn if the kids are quiet in the classroom and listening to them. They will talk through the noise, and it wouldn't have any effect on them as teachers at all, but the kids wouldn't learn anything in those conditions". This conceptualisation acts as an empirical indicator (although a conceptualisation by the teacher, it exists in the concrete world of Branstown School), for a further elaboration which is 'conditions required for pupil learning', which is itself a conceptual indicator for a property 'teachers must structure the environment', of the category 'teaching is controlling'. This is a brief example of the process of conceptual elaboration, and it is notable that these concepts in relation to the individual make more sense when they are located in context, which then involves another deductive effort, only this time along a 'horizontal' dimension, involving the use of 'logical elaboration'.

"...logical deductions are a re-entry of the primarily deductive approach after a bit of grounded theory making. The subtle switch back to the deductive approach occurs because the analyst flashes onto an extant theory that seems to explain or interpret what is going on. Almost immediately he starts deriving hypotheses from extant theory that makes sense in explaining the inductive theory." (Glaser, 1978, p40)
This form of elaboration tends to become important later in the theory generating process, and is a vital component in interpreting the grounded theoretical concepts which can come from many sources. As an example, the author sent a paper concerning the language form of 'rhetorical justification' to the British Journal Of Sociology of Education for review. In accepting the paper one of the reviewers (Dr.Stephen Ball) raised critical points concerning the possible micropolitical strands that were in need of development, and after consultations with Dr. John Evans of Southampton University relevant literature on the micropolitical was reviewed to assist in the researcher interpretation of 'rhetorical justification' within a micropolitical framework.

(7.7) GENERATING CATEGORIES AND CONSTANT COMPARISONS.

Coding allows the researcher to fracture the data and move beyond the first order constructs of the teachers into the level of second order constructs, as Glaser(1978) notes, "it as a sure way to free the analyst from the empirical bonds of data" (p55). As noted previously, the interviews and observation were utilised at Branstown School in a cumulative fashion, and were analysed in the field according to the 'over-view' approach, in which the data is read over quickly to yield an impressionistic cluster of categories, for example, in the first two interviews with Alex the following were some of the themes to emerge; the aims of physical education, the ideal curriculum, the low status of the subject, educating the school hierarchy, departmental conflicts, the place of extra
curricular work, status indicators, Headmaster as critical role definer, individual versus team sports, and mixed ability teaching.

Often during the fieldwork phase of the Branstown Study external pressures, such as, the quest for money for living expenses, meant that the initial thematic analysis guided the next set of observations and interviews. Since the researcher was aware that this could lead to a 'glossing over' of details, every attempt was made to 'run the data open' as soon as the over-view approach was completed. Initially this meant that the researcher had to transcribe the interviews exactly, which in itself developed a deep awareness of their content, and then analyse the transcript line by line. This is an inductive phase of the research process since there is no 'starting list' of codes prior to the field work, nor is there an initial general accounting scheme for codes that is not content specific. Miles and Huberman (1984b) claim that the more inductive researcher may not wish to precode any datum until it has been collected, and that this is an "honourable approach"(p57). They go onto claim that;

"Data gets well molded to the codes that represent them, and we get more of the code-in-use flavour than the generic-code-for-many uses generated by a prefabricated start list. The analyst is more open-minded and more context sensitive." (Miles and Huberman,1984b,p57)

Whilst, Glaser (1978) commenting on open coding notes, that the analyst codes for as many categories that might fit, with different incidences being place in more than one category, and may even code for what is not obviously stated, as categories emerge and core
relevancies develop which allows the researcher to decide on which
direction to take next in theoretical sampling, as the focus becomes
more selective on emergent problems. Unfortunately, neither Glaser
and Strauss (1967) or Glaser (1978) pay much attention to, the source
or categories into which incidents may be classified initially, and
whilst not confined to the following the 'domain' analysis outlined
by Spradley (1979) was influential. He suggests that domains
(categories) may be names for things, cover terms, and semantic
relationships, with the latter being particularly difficult to
identify, indicating that it is useful for the researcher to be aware
of semantic domains of the following sort;

(1) Strict inclusion - X is a kind of Y.
(2) Spatial - X is a place in Y, X is a part of Y.
(3) Cause-effect - X is a result of why, X is a cause of Y.
   Note, this domain as used in the Branstown Study was concerned
   with 'influence' and 'shaping'.
(4) Rationale - X is a reason for doing Y.
(5) Location for action - X is a place for doing Y.
(6) Function - X is used for Y.
(7) Means-end - X is a way to do Y.
(8) Sequence - X is a step (stage) in Y.
(9) Attribution - X is an attribute (characteristic) of Y.

The coding of the interview transcripts was directly onto index
cards. As categories were suggested by the data, the heading was
place at the top of the index card and other comments were added
onto the card if they seemed to fit the category, for example, in
the domain of strict inclusion, the comments on the low scaling of
the department along with comments made to the physical educators by other staff over the non-academic nature of their subject were placed on the card for 'negative status indicators'. Grounded theory is therefore clearly based on a concept-indicator model, which is built up by the constant comparing of (1) indicator to indicator, and then when a conceptual code is generated by (2) also comparing indicators to the emerging concept. From such comparisons the researcher is forced to confront similarities, differences and degrees of consistency of meaning which is the basis of the constant comparison method.

Constant comparison of incidents and concepts is essential in building up the theoretical properties of a category, and once a code has been generated, further indicators can be compared which leads to further conceptual elaboration, refinement, complexity and density, plus the development of 'core' categories. A core category is a 'main theme' which in the researcher's interpretation is the main concern of those involved in the social setting, and is able to sum up in a pattern of behaviour the substance of what is going on in the data. The later chapters focus in detail on the core categories to emerge from this study in terms of teacher 'concerns', such as, teaching involves commitment, teaching is controlling, teachers are autonomous, teaching is achieving, and teaching involves status. It is important to note that whilst these are researcher interpretations they emerged as the concerns of the teachers in relation to the innovation. Likewise, Jones (1985) outlines how the notion of 'significant audiences for performance in
a problem' emerged for her as an important theme in interviews with local government members and officers. Woods (1979) in discussing his 1977 study of a secondary school also provides an excellent example;

"After a terms participant observation in which I talked to over 300 pupils, I listened to all my tapes and read through all my notes. There were regularities in the pupils' conversations with me which provided certain 'themes'. One of their preoccupations was an aversion to being 'shown up' by teachers. Satisfied that this was acutely felt and common enough to warrant further investigation, I engaged in 'theoretical sampling', that is, I purposely began to seek and accumulate material from all sources which bore on the phenomenon.

I constructed a typology, examined the internal structure of the process, considered its functions and results, and who was involved. This is because the functions are connected with general sociological concepts like, power, socialisation and status, and could therefore be related to other contexts." (Woods, 1979, p53)

The constant comparison method and the search for core categories in the Branstown Study was facilitated by the development of 'cognitive mapping' as outlined by Jones (1985) which is similar to the 'patterning' of Miles and Huberman (1984b). Here, once a section of data had been placed into categories, these categories and researcher 'speculations' were linked together diagramatically in the form of a cognitive map to assist the researcher in creating a framework to interpret the categories in relation to social action. The maps were created for each individual teacher, and for the process of innovations as an abstract entity, and then compared to allow elaboration and a network understanding. The use of such maps became an important tool for the researcher in making sense of the mass of data that is available in a case study, and incorporates the intuitive understanding of the researcher with the teachers
understanding of their world. This is, however, a long and laborious process, and Jones (1985) notes:

"At the end of this process I thus have a map and a series of notes that represent my inferences and interpretation of the data. At this point I look at the map as a whole, and draw out the clusters of constructs and relationships that seem to form the substantive categories in the data based on the 'concrete' concepts of the respondent. I also note other categorisations that reflect my own ways of organising the substantive categories in accordance with my own research relevances. These further categorisations may well change as I examine the rest of the data." (Jones, 1985, p.62)

In the Branstown Study themes and categories were explored within an individual's framework and between the physical educators. Hence, each teacher was treated as a 'case' and each was constantly compared to others in the department, and to others, both within the school, and to 'identified research groups' beyond the school, such as, the English teachers in Ball and Lacey's (1980) study. Within the school, such comparisons were useful in illuminating different action strategies, for example, both Alex and Simon displayed 'status concerns', but their proposed strategies for status enhancement differed, with the former proposing an 'aims-objectives alignment', and the latter an 'elite performer strategy'.

Throughout the process of open coding, category generation, and cognitive mapping, the researcher liberally produced 'theoretical memos', which according to Glaser (1978) is the core stage in the process of generating theory, "Memos are the theorizing write-up of ideas about codes and their relationships as they strike the analyst while coding. Memos lead, naturally to abstraction and
ideation" (p83). The memos produced by the researcher in the Branstown study varied in length from a few sentences to several pages, and gave him the opportunity to take 'imaginative flyers' with the connections in the data for later consideration and focusing. This ideational development of memos was particularly important in integrating the connections between themes and clusters of categories, plus it also began to locate the emerging theory, of change as micropolitical, in relation to other theories with potentially more or less relevance. As an example, the emergent researcher conceptualisation of rhetorical justification and proximinal explanation, was seen to be linked to the notion of 'coping' as outlined by Andy Hargreaves (1981) and Pollard (1982), and to Goffman's (1959) work on 'impression management' and 'performance teams'. In addition the work of Ball and Lacey (1980) on 'subject paradigm' and 'subject pedagogy' was seen to assist in explaining the dislocation of practice and theory in relation to the innovation, and also, provide a 'constant comparative' group with their focus on the status concerns of English departments in four schools, enabling this study to illuminate the events within Branstown School. As Lofland and Lofland (1984) point out this form of writing allows the researchers to see connections and implications which may not have been obvious at first but are essential to the analysis.

It is important to note that memoing differs from the writing of detailed description. Although it is based on description, memos are aimed at raising the description to a theoretical level through the conceptual rendering of the material, that is, the original
description is subsumed by the analysis as second order constructs are generated by the researcher in his interpretation of the data. Memos also act as a guide to theoretical sampling until the code is saturated, that is, more data is gathered until the researcher is convinced that the code fits the empirical situation.

As the research act proceeds though time, the nature of the data analysis changes. Ideas are generated initially via a line by line analysis as the researcher becomes sensitised to the data. However, as the concepts and categories are identified, refined, and elaborated, this 'frame' funnels and focuses the researcher so that data selection becomes more selective in the study, and this focusing is seen as essential by Hammersley et al.(1985) and Woods(1985) for the development of theory. Hence, new and interesting directions for the study which do not fit into the framework that has been created, and so falls outside of the research focus, are left for later studies to develop. Thus, towards the end of the fieldwork process, data collection and analysis becomes less pedantic, since the researcher by this time tends to be highly sensitised to the research situation, and is seeking to saturate and elaborate the codes and categories already generated. Logical elaboration of the theory becomes important towards the latter stages of the study, since the aim here is to integrate the theory in order to create an adequate, full and dense account, of the highly complex concrete situation in the school.
1. Hammersley (1985) admits to the influence of such logical positivists as Hempel (1965) and Nagel (1961). The works of these writers have been subject to considerable criticism by Winch (1968).

2. It appears to be generally accepted amongst epistemologists that all facts are 'theory laden', and Hesse (1980) makes a strong claim against the proposition that there can be separate 'observational' and 'theoretical' languages.

3. In probability sampling every unit in the universe under study has the same calculable and non-zero probability of being selected, examples being, simple random sampling, and stratified random sampling. With non-probability sampling there is no means of estimating the probability of units being included in the sample, and there is no guarantee that every element has a chance of being studied, examples being, accidental samples, judgement sampling, opportunistic sampling, and snowball sampling. Honigmann (1982) has outlined the main forms of sampling as used by anthropologists and evaluates the use of these strategies in his own research.

4. Smith and Kieth (1971) in their study of Kensington School indicate these concerns in action.

5. See Burgess (1985), chapter 1.

6. This paper was published in the British Journal of Sociology of Education, vol 8(1), pp 37-53, 1987, under the title, 'Strategic rhetoric: A constraint in changing the practice of teachers'. One of the reviewers was Dr. Stephen Ball of Kings College, London, who kindly introduced himself to me after my paper presentation at the 1986 British Educational Research Association Conference in Bristol, and proceeded to expand my views on the micropolitical nature of many of the events in schools.


8. See Lofland (1971), and Bogdan and Bilken (1982) for a consideration of this inductive phase.

THE GENESIS OF AN INNOVATION
CHAPTER EIGHT

PROVIDING THE CONTEXT FOR INNOVATION
(8.1) THE ANATOMY OF A DEPARTMENT.

The following indicates the staff movement within the department since its inception, along with key meetings. The staff present at the beginning of the study, and who played critical roles in its development are noted by their christian names only, and will continue to be called as such throughout the following chapters in order to avoid confusion to the reader, all other staff mentioned will include surnames or title, such as, Headmaster.

1956 - School opens. Mr. Tallman (Headmaster), Bill Rogers (Head of Physical Education), Shiela Denscombe (Head of Girls Physical Education).

1960 - Shiela Denscombe replaced by Angela Smyth as Head of Girls Physical Education.

1961 - School buildings extended.

1965 - Angela Smyth replaced by Jessie Ashford as Head of Girls Physical Education.

1968 - School extended to present form. Six teachers of physical education.

1974 - Peter joins department as a probationary teacher.

1975 - Bill Rogers becomes Head of Lower School, and is replaced by Boris Green as Head of Physical Education (scale 3). Nick Early appointed as probationary teacher.

1976 - Conflict between Headmaster and Peter (job incident).

1977 - Conflict between Boris Green and Peter over basketball incident, Peter receives official county hall reprimand and loses one days pay.

1979 - Mr. Tallman replaced by Mr. Morris as Headmaster. Laura Hamilton arrives as a probationer.

1980 - Simon and Catherine arrive as probationers (department now of 7). Monica arrives as a supply teacher in September. In April, Jessie Ashford takes official sick leave (nervous
breakdown). Laura Hamilton appointed acting Head of Girls Physical Education. Jessie Ashford accepts disability pension from local authority, and her scale 2 Head of Girls position is advertised in October 1980. Monica gains this position.

1981 - January, Monica takes over as Head of Girls (scale 2).

1982 - Nick Early leaves teaching completely and is replaced by Jeremy, a probationary teacher in September. Boris Green appointed Head of Third Year. Simon appointed as temporary Deputy Head of 3rd Year (scale 2). December, Boris Green leaves to take up scale 4 appointment in Devon.

1983 - January, Monica made Acting Head of Department, and Simon Acting Head of Boys. Alex arrives as new Head of Department (scale 3) in April. Laura Hamilton is replaced by Rachel, a probationary teacher. Monica attends curriculum course in Leeds during half-term of summer term. School curriculum review begins. Andrew Sparkes (researcher) joins department in September. During September Alex decides that the curriculum needs to be changed. At the In-Service day in November (11/11/83) Alex introduces his view that the present curriculum is imbalanced. In December the proposal is voted in that half-year games with its 'top-group' should be replaced by a mixed-ability tutor group system in September 1984.

1984 - Alex informs department that as from September 1984 only physical education specialists will teach in years 1-3. Monica attends D.E.S. regional course on 'The changing focus of physical education' at Cheltenham. Alex and Monica meet with Len Almond in Loughborough in February to discuss the physical education curriculum. Curriculum Meeting 1 and 2 take place in July (P.E. dept only). In September Simon appointed Deputy Head of 3rd Year (scale 2). The new curriculum structure is implemented in September, and in this month Alex begins a two-year diploma course in Educational Management at the polytechnic in Big City.

1985 - September, Catherine leaves to take up a scale 2 Head of Girls in the county, and is replaced by Helen Singleton a probationer. Jeremy leaves at the same time to take up scale 2 post in Kent, is replaced by Daniel Reagen a probationer. Peter gains scale 2 position within school as Deputy in Charge of Timetable.

1986 - January, Monica leaves for scale 2 permanent supply post in Yorkshire, and is replaced by Eleanor Richardson (scale 2). In September, Rachel leaves to take a scale 2 post as Head of Girls at a school in Big City, and is replaced by Ruth Maddock a probationary teacher. Alex gains a diploma in Educational Management.
BRANSTOWN SCHOOL IN SEPTEMBER 1983.

The school, is situated on the south-eastern boundary of a large industrial city called Big City in the West country, and is a highly favoured geographical location which reflects itself in the relatively high cost of housing in the area. The school is situated on a sixty acre site bordering a 'green belt' area and draws its pupils from the new housing area of Longwood (private and council development), and several former villages from the adjoining area. The pupils come from a wide of family backgrounds, but are categorised as predominantly 'working class and lower middle class' by the staff. This area possesses one of the highest concentrations of independent schools in the country which tend to 'cream' off many of the more able pupils from the professional classes. The school started its life in 1956 with an entry of 140 pupils and in the intervening years has grown to its present complement of 1,900. It is a purpose built comprehensive established in three main phases (1956/1961/1968) and now admits approximately 330 pupils into the first year.

The physical education department has excellent facilities, including a sports hall complex set on its own at the eastern wing of the school containing the sports hall, large heated swimming pool, table tennis area (six tables), and changing rooms. Within this complex are the staff changing rooms and the departmental office and coffee area. There is also a purpose built gymnasium in the western wing of the school, and the department has access to two large halls in
the school. Outside, the grounds are extensive and include a fenced off concrete area (able to take 6 tennis courts), two playgrounds marked for 2 hockey and 2 netball pitches, plus a grassed area capable of containing 4 rugby, 2 soccer, 3 hockey, and coaching grids in the autumn term. There is also access to two local sports centres.

(8.3) THE MEMBERS OF THE DEPARTMENT AT THE START OF THE STUDY.

ALEX.- Head of Department (scale 3). Age 28. Six years teaching experience. Married, 2 children. As schoolboy attended a comprehensive school (1100 pupils) having failed his 11 plus examination, where he was a talented sportsman representing his county in football and rugby. Gained a B.Ed (Hons) (2-1) in Physical Education and Geography at an all male specialist college of physical education. Began teaching in 1976 at a selective mixed grammar school (900 pupils) in Essex, where after three years he was promoted within the school to the position of scale 2 Head of Boys. Present sporting interests out of school include tennis, cricket, soccer, and marathon running where he has completed the last two London Marathons in under 4 hours. In school he coaches the following teams, 1st year football, 3rd year rugby, and 2nd year cricket. Joined the department at Branstown in April 1983. Career aspirations in September 1986 were to be a Teacher Advisor. Gained a Diploma in Educational Management in June 1986 from the local polytechnic after two years part-time study.
MONICA. - Head of Girls (scale 2). Age 30. Nine years teaching experience. Married. As a schoolgirl attended an all-girls grammar school (650 pupils) where she displayed little talent at sport. Gained a Certificate of Education in Science of Movement, and Art, at an all women specialist physical education college which has since closed down. Started teaching in 1975 at a comprehensive (1,200 pupils) in Surrey. Left to come to Big City in 1980 as her husband moved his job to the area. Started as a supply teacher at Branstown School in September 1980, and was promoted to scale 2 Head of Girls in January 1981. Made 'acting head of department' in the Spring term of 1983 when she attempted to abolish half-year games but was unanimously defeated in this motion. Attended two important D.E.S. courses, 'The physical education curriculum' at Leeds in the summer term 1983, and 'The changing focus of physical education' in Cheltenham for one day per week February-June 1984. Coaches all the schoolgirls athletics, tennis and rounders in the school, plus U13 and U16 hockey and U13 netball. Outside of school takes part in no physical activity apart from 'spasmodic and irregular aerobic sessions'. Left Branstown in January to follow her husband in his job to Yorkshire, where she gained a scale 2 permanent supply teaching position with the local authority.

PETER. - Scale 1. Age 34. Ten years teaching experience. As schoolboy attended an all boys direct grant grammar school (1000 pupils) in Big City, displaying a wide range of sporting talents. Represented the county in rugby and cricket, and the combined counties in cricket. On leaving school went to work for local
council as a trainee accountant. After eighteen months resigned and joined the ground staff of a famous London cricket club for the summer before going to an all male specialist college of physical education, where he gained a B.Ed (pass) in Physical Education and Geography, and gained full county honours in rugby and cricket. Appointed as a probationer to Branstown School in 1974 by the previous Headmaster Mr. Tallman, and Head of Department Bill Rogers. In school coaches the 4th year teams in rugby, cricket, soccer and basketball. Out of school plays cricket to a high standard and social basketball and rugby. A national league basketball referee who became an international referee in January 1984. In September 1983 his curriculum loading was 50 percent P.E. and 50 percent Maths. In September 1985 gained promotion at Branstown School to a scale 2 Deputy in Charge of Timetable.

Catherine, - Scale 1. Age 25. Four years teaching experience. As a school girl attended an all-girls convent grammar school (600 pupils). Displayed a talent in the only two sports played by the school, netball and rounders. On leaving school at sixteen worked for local government for two and a half years in the Education Department, gaining an O.N.C. in Public Administration. Left this to attend an all female specialist college of physical education where gained a B.Ed (2-2) in Human Movement Studies and English, and gained county honours in netball. Joined Branstown School as a probationer in September 1980. In school organises all school netball and dance, plus coaches 3rd and 4th year netball, plus 1st year hockey. Outside school plays netball at county standard and
coaches the county U16 netball squad. In September 1985 gained a scale 2 Head of Girls post at a school five miles from Big City.

**SIMON.** - Scale 1. Age 25. Married. Four years teaching experience. As a schoolboy attended a large comprehensive (2000 pupils) displaying a talent in rugby and athletics. Went to an all male specialist college of physical education where gained a B.Ed (pass) in Physical Education and History. Joined Branstown School as a probationer in September 1980. Organises school rugby and athletics, plus coaches the 1st XV. Out of school, coaches Big City U15 rugby squad, and himself is a very committed rugby player with a highly successful junior club, where he gained two serious injuries during the course of the study. Was made temporary Deputy Head of 3rd Year (scale 2) in 1982-1983. In September 1984 gained promotion at Branstown School to a permanent scale 2, Deputy Head of 3rd Year. Separated from wife in April 1985, and officially divorced in April 1986. Remarried the same month to Louise who is expecting their baby in November 1986.

**RACHEL.** - Scale 1. Age 23. Probationary teacher. As schoolgirl attended an all girls private school (600 pupils, 11-16 range) before moving to an all girl private boarding school. Displayed a wide range of sporting talents and represented the county in hockey and athletics. Went to a a 'mixed' but 'segregated' specialist college of physical education, gaining a B.Ed (2-2) in Human Movement Studies and Geography. Joined Branstown in September 1983, and coaches 1st year netball, and 2nd 3rd and 4th year hockey. Outside
school coaches and plays for a leading local hockey club, and has represented the county. In September 1986 gained a scale 2 Head of Girls post at a small school in Big City.

**JEREMY.** - Scale 1. Age 25. One years teaching experience. As schoolboy attended a small comprehensive (600 pupils) before transferring to a small boys grammar school, where he displayed his sporting talents, representing the county in soccer and volleyball. On leaving he commuted to London for a year and worked for a large insurance company, before before going to a university in Wales to gain a B.A. in Human Movement Studies and English (2-1), after which he went to a specialist physical education college to gain a P.G.C.E. in Physical Education and English. Joined Branstown School as a probationer in September 1982. Organises school soccer, and coaches the 1st XI, 2nd year soccer and rugby, plus 1st year cricket. Out of school he coaches the Big City U15 soccer squad, and plays junior club rugby in their second team, plus 'social' football on a Sunday. In September 1985 gained a scale 2 post at a large comprehensive in Kent.

(8.4) A HISTORY OF DEPARTMENTAL CONFLICT

In September 1974, Peter was appointed as a probationary teacher in Bill Rogers department by the old headmaster Mr.Tallman, who was renowned in the school for his enthusiasm for cricket and rugby. Departmental folklore has it that, on the mens side at least, he selected teachers for the school who could coach these two major
games, and indeed the school had built up a reputation in and around Big City for being strong in these sports where they regularly won the county cup. During his probationary year Peter enthusiastically coached the 1st XV and cricket XI, and got on well with his Head of Department Bill Rogers. In September 1975 Bill Rogers took up a scale 4 Head of Lower School at Branstown School, and Boris Green was appointed as the new Head of Physical Education. Boris Green attempted to take an authoritarian line with the department which Peter reacted against, and this conflict escalated to the point where in September 1976 he withdrew his services from coaching the school teams, as Peter puts it, "Green was a total shit, there was no way I was going to do anything for him, I couldn't stand the bloke, it was as simple as that".

This decision created tension between Peter and the Headmaster who expected all physical education staff to take a team on a Saturday. In January 1976, a scale 2 post became vacant at a nearby school which was 'tailor made' for Peter who was favourite to get the job. However, Mr. Tallman made a personal phone call to his opposite number at the appointing school and 'warned him off' Peter, who consequently did not even gain an interview. This action was made known to Peter by a close friend at the appointing school who was on the staff selection panel for the advertised post.

During this period Peter was becoming very involved in refereeing basketball and was by now officiating at senior county games. In 1977 Peter took a day off school to go to London and referee a
basketball semi-final, without gaining permission from the school. When Boris Green came to hear of this he reported it to the Headmaster, who on several occasions confronted Peter over his absence, and was constantly informed by Peter that he had been ill on the day in question. This incident was eventually resolved by County Hall who gave Peter a formal reprimand and docked him one days pay. At this time he was told by Mr. Tallman that he would never make progress in terms of his career in the school as long as he was Headmaster. Consequently, Peter withdrew even more from the physical education department and began to take on more maths where possible.

Linked to Peter’s history is that of Nick Early, who came to the department in 1975 having taught previously for two years. By all accounts a very cynical and aggressive young man who immediately joined forces with Peter to undermine Boris Green whenever the opportunity arose. Monica, considering the atmosphere in the department when she arrived notes, "It was terrible, I hated it. The women would never use the coffee area in the sports hall, we would rather walk to the main staffroom at break. Peter and Nick together were absolutely terrible. Boris couldn’t do a thing with them it was embarassing". When Simon arrived as a probationer in 1980 Boris made great efforts to prevent Peter and Nick Early influencing him, as Simon notes;

"Boris was Head of Department, and very much took me under his wing, because the other cynics, shall we say at the time were doing nothing, and he was worried that I would go along with that, that I would turn out like that….He had it working on the
basis that there was only two in the mens department it was that bad."

Since Simon worked well for Boris Green he was seen as 'his man', and was therefore subjected to a great deal of public ridicule and cynicism by Peter and Nick Early. Reflecting upon his relationship with Peter in 1986 Simon notes;

"I get on great with him now, but that's a complete turn around, because when I came here I hated Peter, I absolutely bloody hated him. He was a real bastard to me, he made my life hell, it was bloody awful."

Nick Early left teaching in 1982 to become an insurance salesman, and then Boris Green left in December 1982. This appears to have been a turning point in terms of Peter's relationship with the department. As Simon notes concerning the period when he was Acting Head of Boys for a term;

"Peter was coming around, was coming around a little bit when I had that term with him, as I said he could have been a 'bad one' for me, but he was great, he fell over backwards to help me out. Which made it so much easier, and he is still coming around now, so Alex handles him completely differently from anyone else."

Alex became aware of the conflict when he came for interview, and Boris Green introduced all the department to him in a friendly manner, but simply gave Peter's name and then proceeded to ignore him. Alex checked on Peter's age plus scale position and guessed that all was not well, since it appeared a clear case of a 'spoiled career'. On taking up his post Alex was clearly concerned about the possible problems that Peter could present to him;
"I was very worried when I came here, because Peter could have made it very hard for me in lots of ways, but he went absolutely the other way and made it a very comfortable entry for me into the department." 

Alex was particularly sensitive to Peter and made every effort to reintegrate him into the department, and in September 1983 was able to comment;

"He offers a hell of a lot of time, but he's a very bitter person and to some extent I can understand him being so......he could still be a very good Head of Department on the organizational side. Having said that he wouldn't be the type of Head of Department to argue the subject along into the Curriculum 2000......I have brought him back into the fold in that his attitude to the department is good, and he will work for the department and work for others. He still has this thing that he doesn't attend departmental meetings, this feeling that he's an individual that's slightly outside of it."

Peter gained promotion within the school in September 1985 to the post of Deputy in Charge of Timetable, and began to attend departmental meetings. In September 1986 Alex felt confident in asserting, "He's integrated now, he's back in the fold. That was always my aim to get him working within the department, to make a commitment......Alright, I don't think that I have changed how he teaches in the classroom at all, but he is much more willing to help in the department".

Within the woman's department it was not so much a case of conflict as disruption. In April 1980, Jessie Ashford the Head of Girls suffered a nervous breakdown which was the culmination of several tragedies within her family during the preceding three years. Monica comments on this period;
"I hope that the Head won't hear this, he would say it anyway. They were trying to get rid of her because she had more or less 'flipped', and there was no department as such when I came. In fact it was so bad...the girls were just coming over here and having a riot...Boris Green kept a diary of all the things that were happening. The county were trying to get her to resign." 10

When Jessie Ashford took sick leave, Laura Hamilton who had been appointed as a probationer in 1979, was made Acting Head of Girls. In September Jessie Ashford accepted a disability pension from the local education authority and retired from teaching, and her position was advertised in October 1980. Both Laura Hamilton and Monica (who had been in the department since the previous month on supply) applied for the job. Monica was chosen as the new scale 2 Head of Girls which created an embarrassing situation in the department since Monica did not officially take up this position until January 1981 and notes, "It was very awkward, because then Laura was still employed as Acting Head of Girls until Christmas. So I went for half a term, when I was actually in charge, but not taking responsibility"11.

Historically the womens department were also disadvantaged with regards to the men in their ability to produce successful school teams. Mr.Tallman had not extended his selection policy to include women, who were not appointed depending upon their sporting prowess. Hence, on the staff there were very few female teachers capable or interested in helping with school teams, and this presented a problem in curriculum time with games where the girls department had to rely on a great deal of 'low-quality' poorly motivated non-specialist help. The men also had four in their
department whilst the women only had three, and there was evidence of some residual conflict between the two departments which was often displayed in departmental meetings and in the coffee area. Peter commenting on the 'pointlessness' of having both departments together for meetings notes;

"I don't think that a lot of decisions effect both sides of the department in any case. Basically the women very often get on my bloody nerves, especially one of them, Monica gets right up my nose." 12

Hence, undertones of conflict remained in the department and this was to have a significant influence on the adoption process of Alex's proposals for change13. It was into such a context that Alex arrived as the new Head of Physical Education (scale 3) in April 1983.

(8.5) THE CURRICULUM IN SEPTEMBER 1983 AND THE PROPOSED INNOVATIONS.

Each pupil in the school received two hours of physical education in years 1-5, one hour on games and one hour on physical education. Fourth and fifth year programmes were option based, whilst the 6th year afternoon was on a recreational basis. The outstanding feature of this system which was to be the focus of the innovations was the organization of games in years 1-3 in which major team games dominated the boys curriculum. Pupils were allocated to these lessons according to Houses, and arrived for these sessions together as half-year blocks, that is, ninety boys and ninety girls
approximately. In games the pupils were streamed, and a top-group created which comprised the most able pupils, who then worked with the physical education specialist, whilst the rest were given to non-specialist helpers. During these periods great attention was given to nurturing the potential school team players, and they were often used as an additional 'team practice' in order to maintain the success of the school teams in Big City competitions and leagues.

The innovations suggested by Alex were to make both the two hours 'physical education' on the timetable, and to abolish the half-year games system completely in favour of a tutor group system in years 1-3. Here pupils would come to physical education as a tutor group and remain so for all lessons, with specialist physical education teachers only teaching in years 1-3. This then would prevent the streaming and the selection of a top-group since ALL lessons would be MIXED ABILITY, and allow for a change in the balance of the curriculum away from the domination of major team games to include more individual activities, such as, gymnastics and swimming.

(8.6) NOTES AND AUDIT TRAIL FOR CHAPTER EIGHT.

1. Significant micropolitical moments are outlined in Chapter 14.
3. Field notes, September 1983, Monica.
4. S-83-1-17
5. S-86-8-32
6. S-83-1-18
7. A-83-1-19
8. A-83-1-17/18
10. M-83-1-9
11. M-83-1-9
12. P-84-2-2
13. The male-female conflict is outlined in Chapter 14.
CHAPTER NINE

STRANGERS AND STRUCTURES IN THE PROCESS OF INNOVATION
Phenomenologists propose that people live in 'common sense worlds', an 'everyday world', which is intersubjectively experienced within what Husserl (1970) calls the 'natural attitude'. It is this common-sense world that provides the context for social action, and it is here that people come into relationships with each other and with themselves. This common everyday world is one that is typically taken for granted by the individuals that inhabit it, in that the structures of daily life are not always recognised or appreciated formally. Instead 'common-sense' sees and acts in the 'real' world via a set of implicit assumptions which are contained within a stock of recipe knowledge. This stock of knowledge need not be homogenous, it is often incoherent and partially clear, and often contradictory. It is however sufficiently clear, coherent and consistent to allow those of the 'in-group' to have a reasonable chance of understanding and being understood in their world. As Schutz (1964) argues:

"It is a knowledge of trustworthy recipes for interpreting the social world and for handling things and men in order to obtain the best results in every situation with a minimum of effort by avoiding undesirable consequences. Thus it is the function of the cultural pattern to eliminate troublesome inquiries by offering ready-made directions for use, to replace truth hard to attain by comfortable truisms, and to substitute the self explanatory for the questionable." (Schutz, 1964, p95)

At Branstown School, before the arrival of Alex the department in Simon's terms was 'ticking over', 'running itself', and in this sense...
the social world of the physical education department and the institutionalised forms of social organization within the school were taken for granted by those working there. The activities offered to the pupils on the curriculum, the way the kit stores were organised, the styles with which the teachers operated, were taken for granted because they had 'stood the test' so far, and being socially approved were held to require neither explanation nor justification. This common sense reality provided the matrix within which social action occurred and within which the individuals located themselves according to their 'biographical situation'. The history and development of each individual is seen as unique, and this in turn affected the way in which each individual interpreted what happened in 'their world' at Branstown School. The 'sedimented' structure of the individual's experience is the condition for the subsequent interpretation of all new events and activities, in that 'the' world is transposed into 'my' world in accordance with the relevant elements in 'my' biographical structure. As Schutz (1962) expresses it:

"There is such a selection of things and aspects of things relevant to me at any given moment, whereas other things and other aspects are for the time being of no concern to me, or even out of view. All this is biographically determined, that is, the actor's actual situation has its history, it is the sedimentation of all his previous subjective experiences. They are not experienced by the actor as being anonymous, but as unique and subjectively given to him and to him alone."

(Schutz, 1962, p77)

Whilst each member of the department located themselves by their own biographical situation, there are elements of Alex's biography (in relation to the rest of the department) that placed him in the
position of the phenomenological 'stranger' which Schutz (1964) has used for "an adult individual of our time and civilization who tries to be permanently accepted or at least tolerated by the group which he approaches" (p89). For Alex, as the stranger, the cultural pattern of the department did not have the authority of a tested system of recipes, since he had not taken part in the historical tradition within that particular school by which it was formed (he was of course part of the 'physical education' subculture), even though its history became available to him and influenced the manner in which he attempted to introduce change. For Alex the history of the department had never been an integral part of his own autobiography which contained important elements which allowing him to question it as a taken for granted world.

Besides coming from the 'outside', that is, from another school and another county, there were other aspects which made him a stranger in this new context. The fact that he had experienced teaching at another school was important since within a department of seven, only he and Monica had experience of other schools to compare as an alternative to Branstown, every one else in the department had joined as probationers and remained at Branstown School. Alex, like the rest of the department had attended a specialist physical education college, which although it had a traditional outlook in terms of producing high quality teams, also had a very strong gymnastics bias on the course in which Alex was an able performer and teacher. This is in direct contrast with the rest of the men in the department who lacked experience and confidence in the teaching
of gymnastics, and in particular the form known as educational
gymnastics. At his previous school Alex had been encouraged by his
female Head of Department to attend a great many courses and to
meet as often as possible with other physical educators and
advisors. She herself constantly challenged Alex to justify his
views on education and the worth of the activities he was teaching.
During this five year period he was sensitised to a wide range of
diverse perspectives. This directed him away from the traditional
games orientated perspective of his training college and led to a
clarification (for him) of his present educational philosophy, which
Alex regards as child-centred, egalitarian, and individualistic, with
an inbuilt scepticism concerning what he sees as the traditional
'elitist' approach to physical education which fails to meet the
needs of pupils and cater for all children.

On arriving at the department Alex implicitly assumed the stance of
a stranger by setting himself one year to 'get used to' the school
and 'see what was going on' in the department. The elements of his
biography described meant that his 'thinking as usual' was to
provide vivid contrasts with what was operating in the department
at the time and raise questions which were to disturb the 'taken for
grantedness'. As Schutz(1964) realised;

"To the stranger the cultural pattern of the home group
contrives to be the outcome of an unbroken historical
development and an element of his personal biography, which for
this very reason has been and still is the unquestioned scheme
of reference for his 'relatively natural conception of the
world'. As a matter of course, therefore, the stranger starts to
interpret his new social environment in terms of his thinking
as usual. Within the scheme of reference brought from his home
group, however, he finds a ready-made idea of the pattern
supposedly valid within the approached group – an idea that which necessarily will soon prove inadequate." (Schutz, 1964, p97)

The 'inadequacies' of Alex's interpretation with regards to the contrasting interpretations of his staff were to be made evident as several phases emerged in relation to the proposals for change, and were a critical influence on his initial decision to attempt innovation. The phases that will be described next should not be taken to infer a development in discrete passages of time or unit responses, but rather a cyclic process bound up with the ebb and flow of the teachers' lives as they were acted out in the department and beyond the school gates.

(9.2) PHASES OF ADOPTION

(9.2.1) ORIENTATION.

During the summer term of 1983 Alex noticed little significant difference between the curriculum offered at Branstown and his previous school, he notes;

"It wasn't an immediate reaction, because the first term was the summer term, and in terms of the P.E. curriculum in schools at the moment, and in my last school and this school, I mean it wasn't a lot different......There was a great emphasis on cricket. Athletics was weak compared to my last school, which started me thinking that there was less individual work and more team games going on in the school."

Alex felt at 'home' in this 'typical' summer programme, yet even at this early stage he noticed the emphasis on team games which prevailed. However, his main concern during this term based on his
awareness of the departments history of conflict, was to facilitate social interaction within the department and 'pull the department together'. He notes, "I have found it a very difficult department to pull together, to discuss things and offer opinions as to what they are doing, and how they think other people should do things". In his attempt to open up communication channels within the department Alex related to his staff, and they to him on a 'getting to know each other' basis, which prevented any consideration of each others underlying philosophies on the nature of education, the ongoing reality was not questioned. During this orientation phase Alex did not conceive of the need to make any major changes to the curriculum and nor did his staff.

(9.2.2) THE DAWNING

The early part of the autumn term 1983 was to be a period of 'dawning' for Alex creating a personal crisis, the solutions to which would create crises for those within his department. Commenting on this period he notes;

"It was only little things in the summer term that were cropping up, it was when I looked at the autumn timetable over the summer that I got a shock".

"The turning point came when I was pulling my hair out trying to sort out the first years timetable. I found that some of my first years were having two lessons of rugby per week for the first half term and nothing else.....It was a purely logistical thing. Well it hit me in the summer (holidays), but really in the first half of the autumn term. I went to speak to a number of people in the department and say 'this is not on!' .

"The fact that so much rugby was taught, that didn't hit me immediately, that hit me when I came back......the other thing
that hit me was the amount, how little, gymnastics was taught."

His gradual realisation of the dominance of the major team games at the expense of individual activities, particularly on the boys side of the department created a 'culture shock' for Alex. That some of the boys spent eighty percent of their time in the first term on rugby was simply accepted as 'given' by the men in the department, but to Alex it was highly problematic. Concerning this form of shock Schutz (1962) notes;

"And with respect to the paramount reality of everyday life we, within the natural attitude, are induced to do so because our practical experiences prove the unity and congruity of the world of working as valid and the hypothesis of its reality is irrefutable. Even more this reality seems to us to be the natural one, and we are not ready to, abandon our attitude toward it without having experienced a specific shock which compels us to break through the limits of this 'finite' province of meaning and to shift the accent of reality to another one." (Schutz, 1962, p231)

This culture shock for Alex was linked to his awareness of; (a) his own 'ideal' curriculum, in which there would be a complete expression of self and his educational philosophy; (b) his previous school curriculum, which allowed a great deal of expression for his self and educational philosophy, and (c) the present physical education curriculum which he considered elitist in nature and denied both his self expression and educational philosophies. Alex had knowledge of (a), (b), and (c) with which to frame the present, his department (with the exception of Monica) only had (a) and (c), within which aspects of their own selves were invested. The inability of Alex to
express himself within the prevailing curriculum at Branstown School is made evident in his following comments:

"When I came to this school, as the first term went on I became a little disillusioned because I'd seen a large number of kids, or what I considered to be too large number of kids turning off...I started looking for reasons for it. My reasons were guided to a certain extent because I had this thing built into my mind, that of my perfect system of P.E., and this wasn't my perfect system of P.E."

"When I had that terrible experience of that rugby term, and I really did start to struggle there, I just couldn't accept that form of system.......I was definitely under increased pressure, and I was becoming, how can I put it, internally I was under pressure because I had made a statement to the department early on that I wasn't going to interfere. I wasn't going to change too much. Yet it was totally against my philosophy. I couldn't cope with it, it was an internal pressure in that sense. The real pressure was that I felt I wasn't doing my job properly. I felt that I couldn't live with myself, because it was so bad, it was so elitist. 'Here's what I wanted, here's my philosophy, and here's what the kids were being put through', and I just couldn't agree with it, I just couldn't take it. Honestly I would come back in after a games lesson and see some of the teaching, a lot of it from non-specialists, but the structure that allowed it to happen. I felt like crying sometimes, I would come home and I'd be angry and I was desperate, 'What can I do?. Where can I go? Do I change everything or what?'"

In order to preserve his 'self', plus cope with other institutional pressures of a micropolitical nature, Alex 'decided' to initiate changes and during the early part of the autumn term 1983 'sounded out' the members of the department over the possibility of change during informal conversations. This for several initiated their own 'dawning' phase that Alex had different expectations for the department than did Boris Green. Monica was aware that Alex wished for change, and Jeremy realised early on that changes were likely, he notes, "I must admit I admire Alex as a Head of Department. I
think that he is going to make changes, and I think they will be
good changes". He also realised during these conversations that
Alex was more 'child-centred' than Boris Green who Jeremy saw as a
'traditionalist' concerned mainly with successful school teams and
discipline, and that Alex was not happy with the balance of the
curriculum as it stood, particularly the lack of gymnastics. However,
others in the department did not pick up on these hints from Alex
and remained in the orientation phase. In considering the flexible
nature of the curriculum in October 1983 Peter notes;

"I don't know if Alex is going to do anything extra on that, I
don't know if he'd want to to some extent.....It is a very
flexible system, I don't know if that's a good idea, a bad idea
or what. I don't think that Alex has got any ideas at the
moment to change it." 

Rachel in the same month realised that Alex wanted some form of
change but related it to his concern to improve the status of the
department, whilst Simon still saw the future energies of the
department being channelled into the production of school teams;

"There is so much potential for P.E. in this place. I mean with
the facilities that we've got, Christ Almighty, we should be
brilliant at everything....We should have bloody good teams in
swimming, we should do mens hockey, we have got men on the
staff who can play, they should be able to take it. We should
have a lads tennis team, which we haven't got."  

The 'dawning' for the department as a whole, that Alex was
questioning the content of their curriculum, came on the In-Service
day in November 1983. Here Alex presented his staff with a
breakdown of the activities on the curriculum in terms of individual
and team activities, as given in Figure 3, and attempted to indicate
to them that there was an imbalance, particularly with the boys, in the range of experiences on offer to the children. This was the first direct questioning of the department as a whole and created a crisis of varying degrees for the teachers since their 'thinking as usual', and their relatively natural conception of the world was fragmented by the issues raised by Alex. Schutz (1964) comments upon a 'crisis';

"This will be the case, for example, if there occurs in the individual or social life an event or situation which cannot be met by applying the traditional and habitual pattern of behaviour or interpretation. We call such a situation a crisis - a partial one if it makes only some elements of the world taken for granted questionable, a total one if it invalidates the whole system of reference, the scheme of interpretation itself." (Schutz, 1964, p231)

Such a crisis interrupts the flow of habit and gives rise to changed conditions of consciousness and practice since the cultural patterns no longer function as a system of tested recipes at hand, and their applicability is revealed to be restricted to a given historical situation. As Peter commented angrily to Simon at the end of the morning session, "So we've been totally fucking wrong have we, totally fucking wrong for the last ten years, that's just bloody ridiculous". Once the department realised that Alex was suggesting some kind of change another phase emerged which was to remain a feature of the adoption process, that of ambiguity.
FIGURE 3. BREAKDOWN OF THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION PROGRAMME IN YEARS 1-3, PRESENTED TO DEPARTMENT BY ALEX ON IN-SERVICE DAY.

BOYS.

1st YEAR - Approximately 35% individual activities.

Rugby - 25%
Soccer - 16.5%
Cricket - 16.5%
Swimming - 16.5%
Gymnastics - 8%
Athletics - 16.5%

2nd YEAR - Approximately 35% individual activities.

Rugby - 16.5%
Soccer - 16.5%
Cricket - 16.5%
Swimming - 16.5%
Gymnastics - 8%
Athletics - 16.5%
Basketball - 8%

3rd YEAR - Approximately 32% individual activities.

Rugby - 16.5%
Soccer - 16.5%
Basketball - 8%
Cricket - 8%
Hockey - 8%
Gymnastics - 8%
Athletics - 8%
Swimming - 8%
Tennis - 8%

GIRLS.

1st YEAR - Approximately 66% individual activities.

Netball - 16.5%
Hockey - 16.5%
Gymnastics - 8%
Dance - 16.5%
Swimming - 16.5%
Tennis - 8%
Athletics - 16.5%

2nd YEAR - Approximately 66% individual activities.

Netball - 16.5%
Hockey - 16.5%
Gymnastics - 16.5%
Dance - 8%
Swimming 16.5%
Tennis - 8%
Athletics - 16.5%

3rd YEAR - Approximately 60% individual activities.

Netball - 16.5%
Hockey - 16.5%
Basketball - 8%
Gymnastics 16.5%
Swimming - 8%
Tennis - 16.5%
Athletics - 16.5%

(9.2.3) AMBIGUITY.

Having realised that some form of change was being suggested, several of the department were unsure as to its basis and rationale. This phase was characterised by a great deal of conceptual fuzziness as they attempted to interpret the incoming ideas expounded by Alex at the in-service day and subsequent departmental meetings. After the in-service day Rachel thought that Alex wanted to change the balance of the curriculum in favour of mixed physical education, "I think he wants mixed P.E. or he wants to try it. I think that everyone thinks that it might be a good idea"\(^5\), whilst Jeremy notes, "Certainly I think that Alex wants to pull away from this 'invasion games' syndrome we seem to be in, where everything is geared towards rugby, cricket and football"\(^6\). However, Peter still did not feel there was an imbalance in the curriculum and proposed that more team games should be played, "I would like to see more games played. I'd like to see the school have a volleyball team, and a badminton team. I'd like to see the school having a swimming team, but it's just a case of time"\(^7\). Jeremy in March 1984 admits to a
great deal of confusion concerning the suggestions made by Alex, and in particular the notion of 'games for understanding', as he comments;

"At the moment my head is spinning with all these new ideas. I've had a good discussion with Alex and I think that I basically understand what he is trying to impress upon us about giving the kids a 'why'. A shift in emphasis from skills orientated learning to more social learning." 19

"Obviously there are a lot of grey areas that are only going to be cleared up by doing a bit more chatting and reading...Honestly though Andy, there is a lot I don't understand at the moment. It's probably going to take a long while." 19

Even in May 1984, Jeremy still felt, "I'm still a little in the dark about it" 20 when asked to consider the rationale underlying the structural changes in the curriculum made by Alex. This ambiguity was in part a product of the lack of clarity in Alex's own thinking at the time which prevented him from formulating any clear plan or strategy for change, indeed in the early part of the Autumn term he was not sure what kind of change he desired other than some shift in the balance of activities on offer. He notes;

"It wasn't clear in my mind. The following step wasn't clear in my mind, but I knew that there was a step which had to come later. I knew that this was the first of a number, but when I was putting forward a change in the balance, I didn't have that step in front of me, so I wasn't going to try and jump the gun at that stage, and try to push them into agreeing." 21

At the in-service day Alex met with resistance from several members of the department for the first time 22 and was aware that they were evading the issues that he wanted to discuss. He partly attributed this to his own failure to make a definite proposal, so after this
day he decided to form a definite proposal to focus upon, "Because at the time I didn't have a proposal so nobody could answer it. If I'd have said 'I want to do this and I want to discuss it', they couldn't have come back with a discussion that went of at right angles to it". The definite proposal that Alex came up with was to abolish half-year games which would do away with the elitist practice of the top-group separation, and this was introduced to the next departmental meeting for discussion during December 1983. Alex was later to realise, "That change was the most critical stage, and I didn't realise it at the time...based on the in-service day...I wanted to change the half-year games". This decision by Alex marked the beginning of the translation phase.

(9.2.4) TRANSLATION.

Ambiguity was a cyclic and recurrent process linked closely to that of translation where the physical educators attempted to locate Alex's ideas within their own frameworks. It was also the period when Alex began to conceive of change in more definite concrete terms as he attempted to approximate his 'ideal' curriculum within the constraints imposed at Branstown School. He notes;

"As I was going through these meetings it hit me that only by changing the structure of the curriculum, changing away from half-year games, would I really be able to implement a system which would allow for a more varied curriculum within the school on the P.E. side."  

"Then when I was going through that, I got to that second step - changing the structure, I realised that here was a tool for changing the content of the curriculum. Only by changing the structure could I open the way, open the flood-gates to look at the content. It would allow for changes in the content of the
curriculum. If we had the other system (half-year games) we
would only be able to make minor changes in the content of the
curriculum."

Once this structural change had been conceived by Alex as the means
to translate his ideals into action, he admits that from the
beginning of December 1983, he was "hell bent on getting rid of this
half-year games"27. Support for this translation came from articles
published in the British Journal of Physical Education questioning
the dominance of team games in schools28, and later (February
1984) in a meeting with Len Almond at Loughborough University where
a rationale for the kind of changes that Alex was proposing was
made available to him29. Linked in with his proposals for structural
changes were suggestions for other introductions such as 'games for
understanding' and 'health related fitness', all of which had to be
translated by his staff into their cognitive framework, and this
phase was characterised for several of them by distortion and
intellectual manipulation, allowing them to reconstruct his views
within a frame that would allow for the continuance of their own
customary way of life as the changes were reformulated as 'change
as no change'. This was particularly so with regards to the
conceptions of 'games for understanding', and 'health related
fitness'30. Peter and then Simon in considering these aspects note;

"Basically a lot of these new ideas just aren't, as far as I can
see, aren't new at all as far as I'm concerned. I've done health
related fitness without calling it that as such in my P.E.
lessons all the time...you build up their bodies, and strength
and fitness and so forth, just by doing the normal lessons
without actually calling it 'health related fitness'...I don't
read all these bloody pamphlets, but as far as I can see,
somebody came out and wrote a big article about it or whatever,
so now every one has to do it...people have done it all the
time." 31
"You see this 'teaching through understanding', it's been suggested that it's the new way of teaching. That's how Monica and Alex approach it, as the 'new' way of teaching. But in fact it's not new at all. I've been talking to Bill Rogers, and they tried to bring it in twenty years ago and it got pushed back out again. So all these ideas, none of them are new, they are just called different names, and they just come in and out of fashion as the decades change....I do that any way in my lessons. I really would say that. That's why I would hate people to latch onto this idea that teaching through understanding is the 'only' way to do it, because I think if you are a 'good' teacher you are doing it anyway, and you are doing it as part of the way you teach." 32

Simon also felt that the form of rationale offered by Alex for the changes was an 'over the top' justification, "It didn't seem to me that there was anything dramatically different in what that bloke (Len Almond) was thinking. It didn't seem anything very dramatic and different"33. Such comments indicate a condition of 'false clarity' which according to Fullan(1982) occurs when teachers at a superficial level think they have assimilated innovatory ideas. For several of the teachers this false clarity reinforced the 'change as no change' conception of reality which is best summarised by Rachel;

"We sort of all agreed that there was nothing new in what he'd said, that hopefully we had been trying all along to do those things. It was just maybe a different way of approaching it, it was the same meat just covered in a different sauce." 34

(9.2.5) RESISTANCE.

The structural change from half-year games to mixed-ability tutor groups which Alex had gained 'agreement' on, and had got passed in a departmental meeting by a majority vote at the end of December 1983, did not go without resistance during the adoption period. It
had obvious implications for the way the teachers taught, and the form of their relationships with both students and other staff in the school. The risks inherent in this innovation were assessed by each teacher in terms of its positive or negative value for their own existence in the school. For several, decreased contact with elite players coupled with the possible reduction in the standards of the school teams was seen to have a negative value, whilst for others, increased contact time with mixed ability and a reduction in emphasis on competitive sports was valued positively. The structural changes crystallised the personal risks involved for the teacher in terms of their self expression within the curriculum in terms of both subject paradigm and subject pedagogy, leading on several occasions to an overt form of conflict which revealed the underlying tensions in the department over the changes.

Ball and Lacey (1980) focussing upon subject subcultures use subject paradigm to refer to the view teachers hold as to the content of their subject, whilst subject pedagogy refers to the system of ideas and procedures for the organization of learning in the classroom under specific institutional conditions, that is, appropriate method rather than content. Alex continually challenged the subject paradigm of his staff in departmental meetings, and subject pedagogy was directly challenged by the structural change which was to introduce mixed-ability teaching to games in September 1984. Such challenges made evident specific emergent concerns relating to the innovation which were located within the contrasting, and at times competing perspectives of change within the department.
(9.3) COMPETING PERSPECTIVES ON CHANGE.

As at Ball's (1981a) Beachside School, within the department at Branstown there were several competing perspectives, which provided a matrix of assumptions by which the teachers made sense of the changes. Becker et al (1961) have defined perspectives as

"A coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation, to refer to a person's ordinary way of thinking and feeling about and action in such a situation. These thoughts and actions are coordinated in the sense that the actions flow reasonably, from the actor's point of view, from the ideas contained within the perspective."

(Becker et al,1961,p34)

Taking this view, teacher perspectives may be thought of as constituted by, or as composites of, ideologies, beliefs, values and knowledge, about what should be included in the curriculum and how it should be taught. Embedded within these perspectives were the initial clues to the motives for the actions of the staff in relation to the proposals for innovation, and from within which emergent concerns developed and were clarified.

Accepting Hammersley's (1977) conception of perspectives as dimensional, and not dichotomous two member typologies, then within the physical education department at differing points along a dimension were contained the 'idealist' and 'sporting' perspectives. Before the arrival of Alex the staff to greater or lesser degrees were contained within the sporting perspective, with Peter and Simon operating at its extremes. This is similar to the 'academic' perspective identified by Ball (1981a, 1981b) in which the main
concerns are for maintaining 'standards' and sporting excellence, the focus was upon the elite performer and more able pupils, the production of high physical skill levels and successful school teams which were seen to maintain tradition and the 'good' reputation of the school in the area. The most visible expression of this perspective was the maintenance and legitimation of the 'top-group' in half-year games lessons, in which the most able, with the potential to represent school teams were 'creamed off' into the top-group to be taught by a specialist, whilst the rest were allocated to non-specialist helpers. In Glew's(1983) terms there was a pronounced 'skewing' of curriculum time towards the elite performer, which is made evident in the following extract from the researcher's field diary of October 1983.

"Period 3, observed Simon's 3rd year rugby lesson. After a brief warm up consisting of sets of press-ups and sit-ups interspersed with sprints to the 20 metre line and back, he divided the top-group up into two teams and went immediately into a game, coaching the 'red' team which I assumed was the basis of the school side for tomorrow's inter-school fixture against Claybridge. After 15 minutes Simon asked if I would take a group of 10 pupils away from this game because at that moment 'they were getting in the way' of the scrummaging and mauling practices that he wanted to focus on. I took my group over to the grids and played 'touch rugby' and other conditioned games in order to keep them interested and warm (also to keep myself warm, I'd forgotten my rugby shirt and only had a thin singlet under my tracksuit top). The 10 pupils were smaller compared to the rest in the top-group and obviously did not enjoy physical contact, and were pleased to be with me playing non-contact games. I was enjoying taking them and they were putting in a lot of effort. Twenty minutes before the end of the period Simon came over and said could he have them back, as he has run the members of the team who were present through their practices for the match the next evening and needed some 'numbers' for them to run against so that the moves were 'grooved in' for tomorrow night."
Peter held very similar views to Simon as his following comment indicates;

"I do think that school teams are important, and this new fangled thing that's coming around where school teams ought to be dropped and concentrate on everyone. I don't really think that is a good idea at all.....I think that if you dilute it too much, and if you keep the good ones together with the less able ones, and do a course that is for everybody, without concentrating on the elite at some stage. I think that's doing a disservice to the good kids." 37

Regarding the sporting perspective, Simon makes it clear that elitism is an integral aspect, and one of the major concerns for those holding this perspective was that the introduction of mixed-ability games would reduce the possibilities for producing successful school teams, and create conditions in which the more able were not catered for in curricular time. He notes;

"But in my eyes, if you ever do go for elitism, which to a certain extent we do anyway, it's nice with that large half-year group. I mean Christ it's ninety kids, it's nice to have a top-group. If you have a top-group of thirty you have got something for the others to aim for, that's the group they would like to be in. If they are not capable then obviously they are taught as a mixed ability group." 38

Other elements of this perspective, such as the maintenance of tradition, were often made evident in departmental meetings, particularly when subject paradigm was questioned. The following are extracts from the in-service day (November 1983) and Curriculum Meeting 1 (July 1984) respectively at points where the possibility of removing basketball from the boys curriculum to make room for an individual activity was being discussed.

"Simon - I don't know, I'm only in my fourth year here, but the school has had in the past a very good reputation for
basketball, a very good reputation, and various things have happened in the past and meant that it's dropped off.

Monica - What do you mean, that it's had a good reputation for winning cups?

Simon - It's had a very good reputation for being a good school in basketball and I wouldn't like to see that go."

Simon - "I'd like to see basketball stay there (on 2nd year boys curriculum), because I feel strongly about the team games tradition, and everything else that goes with it."

"Monica - Why do rugby and soccer in the 1st year? Why not have a large sided game and a small sided game?

Simon - Because that's the way sport is played in the area.

Monica - What are you worried about, supporting the area or developing the child?

Simon - Supporting the area and the reputation of the school.

Monica - (Agitated) Well! that's certainly not a departmental opinion. I'll have to disagree on behalf of the ladies, because I think that the child must come first before sport in the area."

Amongst the women Rachel was most firmly located in the sporting perspective, and although she voted for the removal of half-year games she felt that it had many advantages, "You can pick out, say, if your sport was rugby, you get a chance to see the half-year group and you can compare across the year to help select your team."

Also indicated by her, was a definite concern for the more able pupil who would not be 'stretched' or 'pushed' in the future mixed-ability games sessions, reducing the quality of the school teams.

"His (Alex) argument is that the good performers will keep coming to practices, and we will always have the good performers. There might be more problems in the lesson from the point of view that the good ones will get bored perhaps, that they are not stretched enough. But Monica's point was that you should be able to stretch every person in your year. But, I'd
say that perhaps if they didn't have the opposition to play against, if they could beat all the other players in their team, there would be no incentive for them to work hard." 

Throughout the study there was little change in the perspectives of Simon, Peter, and Rachel. Their perspective was in direct contrast to the strong 'idealistic' perspective held by Alex, and to a lesser extent Monica, along with Catherine and Jeremy who claimed to have shifted their position towards this perspective by the end of 1984. At this end of the dimension child-centred teaching, with mixed ability and mixed gender groupings was seen to be an integral part of the comprehensive ideal, which should offer equal opportunity to all the children. Curriculum content is seen to be determined by the needs of the children, who are to be involved and initiated into a wide range of personalised learning experiences in order that a positive attitude be developed towards physical activity in general, both in and out of school. The expression of this idealist perspective was found predominantly in individual activities such as educational gymnastics, dance, and swimming, with the ideal involving a 'Gymnastics and Movement' module for all pupils in years one to three.

From within this perspective Alex was essentially hostile to the sporting perspective, particularly its elitist element, he notes;

"The things stopping us from doing that at the moment (having a balanced curriculum) is the fact that people want to keep the half-year games group, and the only reason that has been put forward for it is that they like to, have the top-group together, the people that they will have in the teams. To give that reason is so elitist......Other than being personal (to Simon) and saying 'You haven't a clue what you are on about, and the whole emphasis of your teaching is wrong'."
"But basically it's an elitist system where they are developing the best pupils to the detriment of others." 46

"Which is incredible in today's thinking, that that is felt to be a logical argument for using half-year games to get an elite system, and they assume that the others will follow the elite. The others will strive to get into that top position, and they'll see that as their main goal and put all their effort into major games....But what I think they fail to realise is that the majority of kids turn off, because not only have they not got a hope in hell of getting near the top group, but some don't want to because they don't like the activity....So not only have they got a sense of failure but they are also turned off the activity." 46

Those holding the extremes of both perspectives within the department were aware of the competing alternatives held. Alex in outlining his conception of the sporting perspective in relation to his own notes;

"If you were to ask Simon and Peter what a successful P.E. department was, they would talk in terms of school teams and how well they were doing, and they would talk about how well certain activities are developed within the school. I think that the basic difference between, not the two schools of thought, but the two philosophies, one you develop the activity, and you develop as many pupils as possible within that activity, and hope that the other things, the educational aims and objectives come along with it, and the development of the child come along with it. Or, you think of the individual first, you think of each individual pupil, and you think how you can develop as many of these as possible by giving them meaningful experiences, and develop a positive attitude towards physical activity so that it's continued after school. You think of it in the wider context, you think of it in the context of the whole school." 47

In contrast to this experiential and social education of the idealist perspective, Simon highlights the direct contrast from within his sporting perspective.

"I see the skill as being the major formal point of the lesson, and the other things are a by-product. I mean they have got five years to pick up a sense of responsibility....But Alex turns that on its head, he would say the responsibility first and the skill second. 48"
The taken for grantedness of the every day world of work contained within these competing perspectives was to provide a framework for confusion, anxiety, resistance and conflict during 1983-1984, as the physical educators attempted to cope with the fragmenting of their realities that the arrival of Alex had instigated. The structural changes introduced, the questioning of subject paradigm and pedagogy, and the need for self expression within the curriculum brought to the surface the central emergent concerns of those teachers involved in change, and these are considered in detail in the following chapters.
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EMERGENT CONCERNS
CHAPTER TEN

COMMITMENT
At Branstown School the physical educators often used words such as, 'inclined', 'keen on', 'incentive', and 'effort' with regards to the innovative ideas and their consequences. In doing so they articulated their conceptions of, and a concern for 'commitment' at several levels, to each other, to the children, to the subject, to their professional future, and to change. These differing conceptions of commitment are essential in understanding the innovative process at Branstown School.

Commitment, in its various forms has been discussed a great deal in the literature, often without any conscious precision as to its meaning, the writers considered below are notable exceptions. Commitment from a profession is of great importance at government level, as the Secretary for Education put it in his White Paper on 'Teacher Quality', "...the school teaching profession continues to serve with reliance and commitment." (D.E.S., 1983, p1). Becker (1960) defined it as a process of placing 'side-bets' in which an individual increased the investment he/she had in a particular career or institution, thus decreasing the likelihood of change to another, and Woods (1979) has elaborated this view with regards to secondary teachers and suggests that their initial training acts against their movement into other occupations, that is, "they are not trained for any other (job)" (p.144). Lortie (1975) used commitment as a synonym for 'involvement' and notes:
"People differ in their readiness to involve themselves in work; to some it is a major engagement; to others something less......One way to define 'involvement' is as the individuals readiness to allocate scarce personal resources to his work. Time and money are personal resources with general value which can be allocated in any number of ways; those who choose to channel such resources to their teaching can be said to be more involved than those who do not." (Lortie,1975,p89)

Smith and Kieth(1971) use the term 'total commitment' to outline one dimension of 'the belief' in an innovative idea.

"By commitment we mean an increase in time and energy beyond the formally contracted 'eight hours per day' and beyond the professional knowledge and skills possessed by the staff." (Smith and Kieth,1971,p103)

This readiness to allocate scarce personal resources is related to the individuals perceived demands of teaching, rather than his/her total identification with an occupation or career structure. Such a conception allows an interactionist viewpoint giving the actors some degree of autonomy, whilst recognising their interdependence with the economic forces and structures, both within the school and society. Kanter(1974) claims that;

"Commitment is a consideration which arises at the intersection of organizational requisites and personal experience. On the one hand, social systems organize to meet their systemic 'needs'; and on the other hand, people orient themselves positively and negatively, emotionally and intellectually, to situations......Commitment, then, refers to the willingness of social actors to give their energy and loyalty to social systems, the attachment of personality systems to social relations which are seen as self expressive." (Kanter,1974,p126).

Lacey(1977) also gives the actor some degree of autonomy when he identifies a 'commitment to school', or 'professional commitment', which indicates the intention of certain students to make a career
in teaching. His use of the term offers a description of personal identification with an occupation rather than a form of entrenchment within its career structure, hence, teachers may be pursuing a career in teaching because they want to, or because they feel they have no alternative. Also identified were a group of students whom he describes as 'liberals', these held strong ideals for education and society, and "if blocked from realizing their ideals through teaching are prepared to explore other means of bringing them about" (p89). These individuals are likely to see their careers within education, but outside of schools, that is, they were 'committed to education'.

Based on her sample of primary teachers Nias (1981) revealed 'commitment' to be used in four different senses; as caring, a concern for occupational competence, personal identification as teacher, and career-continuance. The first two involved a readiness to devote personal resources to work, whilst the last two suggested an intention to make a career in teaching. Attribution of motives for commitment was also seen to act as a means of differentiating individuals and subject groupings.

"I soon perceived that both teachers and headteachers frequently used the term to describe themselves and each other, and that, in certain contexts, it was regarded as a valid characteristic for distinguishing one individual or group of teachers from another." (Nias, 1981, p184).

The physical educators at Branstown School used the term commitment as a means of reflecting upon their careers, and the careers of others; themselves as teachers and others as teachers; their own involvement in innovation and the involvement of others. The
following sections considers specific usage of the term in relation to the innovation process within the framework previously outlined.

(10.2) COMMITMENT AS CARING

Unlike Nias's (1981) junior school teachers words such as 'loving' and 'caring' were not in great evidence in the department, which may be as much a reflection on the emotive use of such words in secondary education in general, and physical education in particular. That teachers had to be 'caring' was a taken for granted reality as one aspect of the role of in loco parentis, and was used to differentiate other professional groups and individuals. Catherine whose boyfriend at the time was a doctor, pointed out to her colleagues in a staffroom conversation over salaries that a great many doctors cared less for their patients than teachers did about children. Nursing was another 'caring' profession that was pointed out as being underpaid and undervalued by society in the discussion.

Caring was expressed in the form of identification and empathy with the less able by Jeremy.

"I like kids, I can sort of identify with them. It sounds really big headed, but I really like kids, and I like the things that they get up to. I like naughty kids in a way."  

"If you can't imagine what the fat kid feels, what problems he's having in terms of strength-weight ratio, then you are lost really. You have got to be sympathetic to their poor standard, and try to understand."
Catherine became very defensive when it was suggested by the researcher that certain teachers would support the innovation in order to gain scale points.

"At the end of the day, if you are going to provide a better education for the kids then that's the reason for doing it, not anything else. Maybe that sounds a bit idealistic, but I do think that's the case." 4

Alex, whilst realising that the change from half-year games to a tutor group system would put greater pressure on the specialist teacher justified it in terms of "It's for the benefit of the children". He also admits that his strong socialist views had an inbuilt concern for the 'underdog' and the less able, which linked into his conception of an egalitarian curriculum, he notes;

"My politics would make it very difficult for me to support an elitist system, that's for sure. I'm a great one really for the losers in life, when it comes to someone who has failed in something, or is not very good at something.....it's got a lot to do with my background and education." 6

Caring was frequently used to demarcate 'good' teachers from 'bad' teachers. Jeremy considers that many excellent sportsmen made 'bad' teachers because they have never had to struggle with learning skills, and therefore could not empathise with the less able children. At working lunches during 1983-1984, Alex continued to raise the issue of whether the present curriculum met the needs of the children, and saw the elitist element contained within the sporting perspective as not caring for individual needs, which by implication was 'bad' teaching, as his following comments on the possibility that some of his staff, and Simon in particular, might
manipulate the new tutor group system in order to recreate a top-

group indicates.

"But trying to get over to him this simple concept, that the
child has to come first and the all round development of the
kid, and the experiences we have to offer the kid has to come
first before school sport and the tradition of the school."  

"I hope they wouldn't, but it's quite possible that if you have
got someone that way, that they will be lazy. I don't think that
they are lazy, it's just that some can be elitist. You have to be
extremely lazy, you'd have to be elitist, and you'd have to be a
very uncaring teacher to allow that to develop, when those boys,
the less able ones spending long lessons doing large games
where they are not getting anything out of it."  

The concept of caring was also used by those holding the sporting
perspective to question the motives for the innovation. Simon
presented a paper by Peter at a departmental working lunch which
outlined his objections to changing half-year to tutor groups and
notes;

"Yes, one thing that Peter wrote in his brief that I took over
for him was, because Jackie Lane is the girls P.E. advisor, 'Why
are we doing this? Are we doing this really for the kids
benefit, or are we changing it for Lane and the advisors?'  

Such comments attempt to imply that those involved in supporting
the changes may not have the childrens interests at heart but are
motivated by the need to impress the advisors, and as such both
perspectives contained within the department were involved in
direct attempts to undermine 'others' conception of themselves as
'caring teacher' involved in change. Considerations of promotion and
wealth were not considered legitimate reasons for promoting changes
(in the public arena at least), or indeed for being in teaching at
all, and such considerations were categorised by the physical
educators as the 'wrong' reasons for being in teaching in the first place'.

(10.3) COMMITMENT AS EXPENDITURE OF TIME AND ENERGY.

In a busy school day energy and time have to be allocated sparingly, yet high involvement was seen to be central to the role of physical educator, as Simon noted;

"More than anything else just the idea that you are willing, it isn't a contradiction in terms, but you are just willing to get involved in things. If somebody asks you to do something for the kids, it sounds corny actually, you are willing to do it and you don't make excuses to get out of it." 12

Such 'willingness' according to Mias(1981) forms part of a commitment to occupational competence, characterised by a concern with taking the job seriously and make it work. However, she fails to illustrate how such willingness is selective in its direction, that is, school events do not get uniform 'doses' of involvement, and the physical educators were more prepared to channel their energies in some directions than others. At times this channelling was seen to provide a visible denial of occupational competence in certain aspects of school life, which in turn was seen to reflect in a negative manner upon the department, as the following statement by Monica, on the behaviour of several of the department on the in-service day indicates.

"And this is typical. In the afternoon three went down to the pub, I think they all went down. I didn't go down or Alex, but most people went to the pub, and so we couldn't start till everyone got back, and Peter and Simon came back late. So we were all sitting around waiting. I just find it embarrassing for
the department, it shows it off in a bad light. Then as soon as they arrived they went down to the groundsman to get him to do a pitch for the next day. It's just wrong."

The apparent lack of willingness to take the job seriously on this occasion was more damaging because the physical education department had been paired with the chemistry department to discuss the school curriculum, and were therefore 'on show' in terms of their visibility of commitment to occupational competence, which was itself related to desires to raise the status of the subject within the school. In this situation, however, Peter and Simon were not as prepared to commit themselves to the joint meeting with chemistry, to them it was an 'irrelevant waste of time', the negotiations with the groundsman were more important in their system of relevancies on that particular day as they needed to ensure that the pitches were marked for school matches at the weekend.

There is another aspect of occupational competence which makes reference to the need for 'high professional standards'. Here, 'committed' teachers constantly seek to improve their knowledge and expertise by going on courses and/or referring to acknowledged experts for advice. Courses taken outside of school time were seen as a very positive indicator of commitment, and Simon realised that in terms of gaining promotion 'they' always took note of how many courses the teacher had been on even, "if they were crap and you learnt absolutely bugger all." whilst Catherine also noted that if she was to gain promotion elsewhere that she would need to attend some in-service courses in the near future. The important part for
the teacher was the visible display rather than the learning content of the course, and Alex claimed that in selecting a candidate for interview he would take into consideration the courses listed in the curriculum vitae since it was an indicator that the candidate had maintained an interest in the subject and was not a 'nine-to-fourer', that is, the individual was prepared to put in some time out of school. Alex's own involvement in the management studies diploma between 1984-1986 was seen as a major extra commitment, and Simon notes:

"Even the Head said that was an awful lot of time and an awful lot of commitment - but having done it, if the Head sees it as an awful lot of commitment, then that's an 'A-Plus', that's very good for Alex in terms of his future." 

Investments of energy and time were, therefore, made in selected areas of school life and life outside of school. Getting his staff to retain and extend their involvement in the department and the subject, plus invest in his innovations was seen by Alex as a critical part of his role as Head of Department in order to create an efficient and functioning unit. Due to the history of the department he realised early on that he would have to develop strategies to ensure a greater commitment from Peter's in particular, as part of his attempt to pull a fragmented department together as a cohesive unit.

One of Alex's first moves was to take on the supervision of the Thursday evening detentions, an arduous task much disliked by those in the department. He felt that this would be a sign to staff that
he was prepared to do the mundane jobs, plus it would allow him to ask them for favours in the future. Alex also reorganized the responsibilities within the department making it clear in which areas he could, and would, expect a direction of energies by each particular member. At the meeting where this was outlined he claimed that some 'bad feeling' was produced because he had to point out that some in the department were not meeting their commitments in terms of occupational competence, but he felt this initial conflict was worth it in the long run because staff then knew what was expected from them by him.

Taking on 'responsibilities', such as, 'teacher in charge of hockey' or 'teacher in charge of football', were seen to be positive sanctions given to staff by the head of department who controlled their allocation, since once again they were visible signs of commitment for curriculum vitae purposes and also enhanced personal status within the school. Directing energies into positions of responsibility within the department was carefully negotiated based on the particular 'interests' and 'expertise' of the individual, for example, Catherine was the netball 'specialist' who played at county level in her own time and was therefore the 'obvious' choice to take charge of school netball. Alex and Monica took such interests into consideration before allocating responsibilities, since in terms of commitment they felt that personal 'interests' were dominant factors, that is, the more interested the individual in an activity, the more time and effort they would put into it. Peter also noted
how occupational commitment is greater in those activities that teachers enjoy, in his instance team sports.

"I suppose it's because I enjoy them more. I think that's a lot of it, the things you enjoy, I suppose subconsciously you put more effort into it. You enjoy it and the personality comes over more and the kids respond to it. If you're not quite sold on the idea, then you don't sell the idea as well, and it's more difficult to teach in that respect because the kids don't respond." 19

In terms of gaining extra involvement from staff, and Peter in particular, Alex realised the importance of gaining another scale point for the department. This extra point would mean that he would enhance his ability to delegate duties and "lean on them more"20, in terms of distributing responsibilities and administrative duties, plus expecting their support in terms of the departmental policies that were instigated by him. In this context it is interesting to note that Alex saw the next scale point going to Peter or Simon, the two main resistors to his innovations in the department as a means to increase their compliance to the future changes in the curriculum.

In relation to socialisation patterns, involvement, in terms of taking on administrative and extra curricular responsibilities, was seen as an important career development by the teachers, and both Alex and Monica saw it as part of their role in staff development to ensure that staff would be capable of running a department in future years. Staff development may be interpreted as 'staff socialization' in how to perform the role of Head of Department and relates to the adoption of the 'appropriate' attitudes towards the school as a system and those working within it. Such
responsibilities that are taken on, are therefore, critical side-bets in the future for the aspiring teacher, and are side-bets of equal importance for the head of department in terms of gaining commitment and support from his staff in the day-to-day running of the department and in the acceptance of proposed policies. This has important implications for a head of department since the actions of their staff in terms of visible commitment is taken as a reflection on his/her ability to manage by the school hierarchy, which in turn effects their own career development. As Alex notes;

"They look at the school, then they look at me. They don't look at the person who I have made responsible for it.....They look at me they don't look at anyone else in the department. They might look at them afterwards. I don't point the finger. I have to carry the can." 21

"Mistakes", therefore, are acceptable as part of a learning process, but at certain points they are taken to indicate a lack of commitment to occupational competence which threatens to undermine the department plus its Head within the school environment, and it was therefore essential to ensure that new recruits would direct their energies in the acceptable direction of Alex's policies. His concern to promote an investment by his staff into his innovative ideas was indicated in his job specification made available to applicants for the scale 1 post made vacant when Rachel left in September 1986.

"The successful candidate should be familiar with, and sympathetic to a child centred approach, through mixed ability teaching. An understanding of the place of Health Related Fitness within the curriculum along with a commitment to school-community links with senior pupils would also be of advantage. Teaching strengths in the areas of hockey and gymnastics are also desirable." 22
In September 1986 Alex made it plain that every appointment he had made since Rachel in September 1983, was with the intention of recruiting teachers who were sympathetic to his educational philosophy, and would be prepared to invest time and energy in creating his ideal curriculum. Despite this recruitment the energy expenditure involved with the changes continued to be a source of dissatisfaction for Simon and Peter, who saw the new structure of mixed ability tutor groupings in games along with specialists in years 1-3, as demanding too much of the physical education staff.

"It seems to me, it may be wrong, but the onus is then going to be very much on the P.E. staff to do everything." 24

"The whole new system about changing, I don't see why, the new system seems to make an awful lot more work for the P.E. department when there wasn't any need to, in terms of communications that are going to be essential for getting your teams together and everything else. I don't see why you have to create more hassle, there just doesn't seem any point to me." 25

In terms of Simon's and Peter's systems of relevancies, energy was actually being wasted since they saw the 'old' system as much more efficient in the production of school teams. Linked to this was the necessity for the school teams production system to rely on non-physical educators to assist in training and coaching the teams.

"In terms of doing it all, we rely heavily, we don't rely heavily, but we have got the support of a lot of members of staff in the school, and it eases the load. It's great, Christ, we could have had three members of staff for every soccer team last year. That's including the one P.E. specialist obviously. That superb, and although Alex will get enough to do his teams and everything, I just wonder if it's something that people won't give their time as readily as they have before." 26
Within the working week of the school informal negotiations took place to provide incentives for non-specialists to invest their efforts into taking a school team in extra-curricular time. The non-specialists (with the exception of one who played top level junior rugby and helped Simon with the top-group) were always allocated one of the 'rabble' groups, that is, a non-top group for games and given free reign to do what they liked, for example, Lippy Longton simply played rugby league with his group whilst the rest did rugby union. Simon and Peter felt that this break from classroom routine was a 'perk' for these teachers during curriculum time, and provided an incentive for them to assist with school teams, the withdrawal of these perks in the 'new' system was seen to remove these perks which would eventually result in a lowering of the standards of the school teams.

"Davy Johnson, he sees Friday period five as a 'doss'. Rugby is fine and you take them out or whatever. During that lesson he has twenty two kids and if I know Davy he gives them a football and they have a run-a-round. During the rest of the year Davy gives a hell of a lot of time to the department, taking teams and helping out. He's got a superb relationship with the kids. I think he is the kind of person you don't want to lose. He genuinely doesn't seem happy. He doesn't know whether he'd want to take a team next year, if he wasn't going to get his hours as a perk." 27

In contrast, Alex did not see the continued commitment of such staff to school teams as problematic since a major consideration for him was the 'quality' of the experiences provided in curricular time rather than the production of school teams. Hence, specialist teachers were essential in years 1-3, also that non-specialists saw it as an 'easy' lesson was seen to undermine his quest for subject
status within the school. The involvement of these teachers was a liability in his eyes, talking about Simon and Peter's fears of upsetting staff like Lippy Longton he notes, "I couldn't give a sod what Lippy thinks, that is totally irrelevant to how I see the curriculum, the people that are important to impress have all indicated that they see the new system as good". Alex also claimed that he had done a survey of the staff who take teams, and that only one was not keen to take a team next year, and that had nothing to do with the introduction of the new system, indeed he claimed that once it was explained to them that the children would benefit from the new system they all agreed that it would be better.

It is evident that physical educators saw the innovations as making demands on their time and energy which were legitimised or reacted against depending upon the definitions of 'subject paradigm' held by each individual. That there were strategic placements of commitment is made more evident in the following section dealing with career aspirations which were intimately linked to the individual's decision to invest in supporting the innovations at various levels.

(10.4) COMMITMENT AS CAREER CONTINUANCE.

The commonly understood concept of 'career', according to Wilensky (1960), is as a "succession of related jobs, arranged in a hierarchy of prestige, through which persons move in an ordered predictable sequence" (p127). For the physical educators at Branstown
School a typical career structure was seen as firstly the advancement from probationer to assistant teacher, then either greater specialisation within the subject leading to 'second in a department', then onto Head of Girls/Boys, and eventually ending up as Head of Department. Alternatively at some point in this career path the teacher had to display a commitment to counselling roles within the pastoral system which would open up a career avenue via Deputy Head of Year, then Head of Year, and onto Head of Lower or Upper School. The possibilities of becoming a Deputy Headteacher or Headteacher were not excluded (Alex aspired to a Deputy Headship in 1984) but were seen as utopian by the majority of the department in the prevailing economic climate when linked to the low status of physical education as a subject.

The above merely provides the bare bones of the formal career structure. The evidence presented below indicates clearly that people do not experience their careers in quite such an orderly and systematic fashion. As Hughes (1958) realised the individual's career might not correspond to a simple, wordly progress upwards, and should be seen, "as the moving perspective in which the person sees his life as a whole and interprets the meanings of his various attributes, actions and the things which happen to him" (p409). Hence the following considers what Woods (1983) would classify as the 'subjective careers' of the physical educators in relation to the innovation, which has the potential for linking the individual's experience with the institutional provision of formal careers.
In the Autumn term 1983 all the department at Branstown School expressed their intention to remain in education. Their aspirations were framed within the formal career structure offered within the profession of teaching, which was seen to be a contracting system due to government cuts by the Conservative party. Rachel, Catherine, Jeremy and Simon aspired to the position of Head of Department, Monica to the advisory service (in an unknown capacity), and Alex to Deputy Headmaster, whilst Peter was not sure of the future direction of his career, feeling it would be in schools but not in physical education.

In September 1986, Catherine is a scale 2 Head of Girls at a large comprehensive, Rachel a scale 2 Head of Girls at a small school with a department of 4 in Big City, Jeremy is a scale 2 as 'second in command on the 'boys side' at a large comprehensive in Kent, and Monica is a scale 2 permanent supply 'roving trouble-shooter' with an authority in the Yorkshire going into schools for various periods when staff have maternity leave or lose time through injury (her aspirations are still to the advisory side). Of those remaining at Brantown School, Simon is a scale 2 Deputy Head of Year, Peter is scale 2 Deputy in Charge of Timetable, and Alex remains on a scale 3, but is hoping for a scale 4 in the very near future, and has started to apply for positions in the advisory service as a 'teacher advisor'.

This upward career progression of staff was seen as a strong point in attracting applicants for posts, as the information sheet for
Rachel's replacement indicates, "This post has arisen as a result of the promotion of the present post holder. The fourth scale one teacher to be promoted out of the school to Head of Department status, in the last three years.......They will have to work closely with a committed team of specialists". Thus career advancement was seen as vital and this was felt to depend upon visible displays of commitment. However, as noted in the previous section teachers choose to direct their energies in some directions rather than others, as a side bet for their future career. As Sikes et al(1985) note;

"For teachers of all subjects, a strong commitment has implications for career development in terms of progress up through the scale post hierarchy. Insofar as promotion tends to involve more administrative, managerial or pastoral type work and less subject teaching, teachers have to weigh up their needs for greater remuneration - which may be an important consideration as their familial and domestic commitments increase. They have also to weigh the attractions of enhanced prestige against the need for contact with the subject." (Sikes et al,1985,p192)

It is important to note that several of the teachers did not make an early commitment to teaching as a career. Jeremy took a year off after getting 'A' levels and was not sure what he wanted to do. He got a well paid job in London with an insurance company which entailed commuting 'up' from Surrey every day. Against parental wishes Jeremy gave up this career option due to the boredom, routine, and humdrum of office life. He elected to study for a degree in Human Movement Studies since he felt that it would be enjoyable (based on his school experience of physical education), and interesting on a daily basis, besides which 'money isn't
everything'. Even at university Jeremy was unsure that he would go into teaching until he gained a positive experience when working with children for his Football Association Preliminary Coaching Badge, he notes:

"When I first went I wasn't sure what I was going to do, what it was going to lead to. I thought it was three years, and at least it was something to show to the employer, though I didn't know who that would be. But as soon as I did that (taught children on the course), I thought well that's it, I want to teach or lecture in some way." 31

On starting his probationary year at Branstown School in September 1982, Jeremy was still not sure that his future lay in teaching. In his second year of teaching he notes:

"I always said to myself that I'd give it five years, and if I wasn't getting as much satisfaction out of it as I was say, in the first two or three years, then I would definitely quit and look for something else, in sports management or something totally different." 32

Satisfaction was taken to involve relationships with the kids, enjoyment of an active job, and making progress on the career ladder. Jeremy makes it clear that he would not be satisfied to stay on a scale 1 for an extended period.

"I know that I have been trained for four years and I want to be paid for it. I want to be remunerated in the right way. I obviously want to get on, I really do." 33

Peter also did not go straight into teaching when he left school, having little idea of a career direction.

"When I left school I didn't know what the hell I wanted to do. I just worked for the council, sort of trainee accountancy in some form, day release job, and I had enough of that, eighteen months, yes about eighteen months. Then I went and played
cricket up at the Lords groundstaff for a summer, and then I went to college in the September."

Similarly, Catherine worked for local government for two and a half years gaining an O.N.C. in Public Administration before choosing to go to college to study Human Movement Studies.

"But then it became more obvious to me that I was missing something. I'd missed not going to college. I was still keeping up sport, playing county netball and things like that."

However, once these teachers joined the profession they accepted the structural arrangements of promotion and started to selectively divert their energy into career advancement along certain channels, in the same manner as those who has chosen to go into teaching on leaving school (Alex, Monica, and Rachel). It has been recognised by several researchers that many teachers do not see themselves as committed to a lifelong career in teaching, yet only Jeremy expressed reservations (which were removed when he gained his scale 2 position), the rest of the department were firmly committed to career continuance.

Having made such a commitment the physical educators had then to come to terms with a 'paradox', which may be particular to physical education and has definite consequences for the directional flow of time and energy to the subject. This paradox is best explained by Simon in the following comment:

"The dumb thing about P.E. is, that you have got to decide almost as soon as you get into it, that you are going to get out. I'd love to do P.E. until they bloody wheeled me out, but to me if I go down there (the sports hall) and we are doing lay-ups in basketball. When it gets to the point where I can't
show them a lay-up shot, or if we are doing gym and we are
doing head-springs or neck springs, then I want to get out." 38

A career in physical education was seen to be bounded by an age
structure, and Hendry(1975, 1978a,1978b) claims that this is a young
persons subject, whilst Sikes(1985) also notes;

"Pupils like policemen, continually get younger - or so many
teachers say. By virtue of the nature of their job it is
difficult for teachers, as it is for obstetricians and lollipop
people, to avoid recognising their own mortality. As social
systems, schools are affected and influenced by the processes
occurring within them. The ageing of staff is but one of these
processes." (Sikes,1985,p27)

For physical educators ageing takes on even greater significance due
to the physical debilitation that occurs naturally over the years
and provides a deep rooted threat to the self as capable performer
and competent sportsperson. Long term careers in physical education
were not expected, either by the physical educators or significant
others, and when Catherine was questioned as to where she saw
herself in twenty years she noted;

"That reminds me of a remark from my father, 'Well, what are you
going to do when you are thirty?', as though you are going to
outgrow it." 39

It would be suprising if such a remark had been made to a Chemistry
teacher, and the choice of thirty merely emphasises the critical
nature of age. Monica, Peter and Alex on several occasions joked
about 'getting too old for this business' when they had to take
groups outside in the middle of winter. Such 'jokes' were reinforced
by staffroom banter from other teachers, 'Hey Peter, saw you taking
3RG out today, they'll run rings around an old man like you"40.
Similarly Alex was ribbed concerning his entry for his second London marathon, 'You'll end up with a heart attack at your age', or 'Christ Alex, I really do admire your fitness, you must be bloody fit for your age, I wish to hell I was, but I like my beer too much"'. Hence even when the comment has a positive content it still defines the age factor as crucial for the physical educator.

All the department at Branstown School were concerned over age, mainly in relation to the impossibility of maintaining their enthusiasm for a physically demanding subject in which their ability to demonstrate skills would diminish. To be in physical education beyond forty years of age was seen as out of the ordinary, and the individual was seen in many ways to have failed to negotiate the career system to his/her advantage. As an indicator of such age norms, one local physical educator who was nearing sixty years of age and still involved in physical education full time was nicknamed 'Peter Pan'. Linked to the age factor was an awareness that due to the low status of the subject, the chances of promotion to senior positions in the school system (Headmaster, Deputy Head) were extremely low. Hilsum and Start(1974), and Bennet(1985) indicate how another low status subject, art, also has comparatively poor promotion prospects when compared to sciences. The physical educators acknowledged that often to 'get on', the only way was to 'get out' of the subject. In relation to his reasons for going on the Diploma in Educational Management in September 1984, Alex notes;

"It's keeping my mind active, and it may be a possible stepping stone sometime in the future when I want to move. I haven't really thought in depth about where I want to go.....I want to
concentrate on staying in schools right now. If I stay in schools I've got to move away from P.E. at some stage." 

It appears that in physical education side-bets must be placed strategically early on in the career race with a view to leaving the subject at some point depending upon the subjective career map formulated by the individual in relation to a variety of self interests coupled with an awareness of the prevailing economic circumstances. All the department taught their second subject and considered it vital to maintain this link with the classroom, indeed Peter was on fifty percent maths in 1984, and having gained a scale 2 position as Deputy in Charge of Timetable in 1985, definitely saw his future career development in Maths and the administrative side of the school. Catherine had become involved in the Design For Living course and the youth club in 1983, whilst an emergent interest over the year was Teaching English as a Foreign Language with a view to taking a job overseas if she did not gain a scale 2 position soon. For these teachers subject commitment, was reduced during this period as alternative avenues are explored and decided upon. In contrast Penny in 1984, was directing all her energies to gaining subject expertise and as yet had not considered any movement out of physical education. Lacey(1977) notes how for entrants into teaching promotion ambitions are typically to be Head of Department with pastoral posts of responsibility not holding any great attraction. The reasons he proposed for this were (1) young teachers are less aware of career possibilities within the pastoral structure; (2) they tend to identify with the subject and are less willing to consider spending less time working with it; and (3) they
are too close in age to the pupils to consider taking on a parental type guidance role.

(10.5) CRITICAL INCIDENTS AND COMMITMENT.

Commitment is not a uniform commodity, at Branstown School the interviews and observations revealed that it ebbed and flowed in different directions over time, which were often linked to critical incidents in the individual's biography. Critical incidents are key events in the individual's life around which pivotal decisions revolve. These events provoke the individual into selecting particular kinds of action, which in turn leads them in particular directions, and end up having implications for identity. Strauss and Rainwater (1962) discussed "periods of strain" (p105) in the lives of the chemists they were researching, noting that during these critical phases, particular events occur, which are important, whilst Walker (1976) focusing on teachers' careers used the term 'critical incidents' to describe such events. Becker (1966) considered "these crucial interactive episodes, in which new lines of individual and collective activity are formed.....and new aspects of self are brought into being" (p.xiv), and Measor (1985b) claims that their study reveals, "like a flashbulb, the major choice and change times in people's lives." (p61). In order to highlight the effects of critical incidents in relation to commitment to change, certain aspects of Simon's biography will be considered, as these indicate how perceptions of subjective careers shift over time depending upon
'extrinsic', 'intrinsic' and 'personal' circumstances, or in Morgan's (1986) terms, task, career, and extramural interests.

On entry into teaching in 1980 Simon entered a conflict ridden department at Branstown School. Under the patronage of the then Head of Department, Boris Green, he came to view himself as a 'fast mover' in career terms, as somebody who liked to do things 'ahead of their time', his example of taking the large assembly whilst still being a probationer, being given a 5th year tutor group (most probationers in the school get a 1st year group), and coaching a very successful rugby team (even though, he admits, it had nothing to do with his coaching), provides good examples of this.

"So it immediately starts to rub off, you know, 'Who is the person with the rugby teams, who is the person taking assemblies, who is the person in the House?'. I think I had a good first year........You can put different labels on that, I think I prefer to do things ahead of my time rather than do them when somebody else thinks you are ready. I mean some people have been in teaching for years and never taken an assembly, and don't know what it's like to stand up in front of three hundred and sixty kids."

In addition because of the conflict within the department Boris Green promised Simon that within a year of him starting teaching he would have the rugby, athletics and cross-country for himself as positions of responsibility which enforced the image of 'fast mover' in career terms. Commitment at this time to career continuance and occupational competence was very high;

"The first two years I would wonder, because I didn't have a sense of responsibility in terms of my home life. There was more to do in school, school was the most important thing and other things went by the board. Which was perhaps a little wrong, and very selfish on Elaine (his wife) actually."
In addition his wife had obtained a scale 2 post at a special school, plus they had just bought a house, and Simon admits in September 1983, that even if a job became vacant in another part of the country, he "could not afford to leave the area"^a^7, since they could not afford to lose his wife's income. However, Simon's over-involvement in school life was to have serious consequences for his marriage, and in March 1986, having separated for a year they got divorced. He admits;

"When I first started it was all school, I never saw Elaine, I worked my ass off to get on and we split up for that very reason - we ended up bloody strangers. Having started like that, that's how it finished - for that basic reason"^a^9

This commitment gained early rewards when in 1982-1983 Simon was made Deputy Head of 1st year on a temporary scale 2, under Boris Green's patronage who was then temporary Head of Year. When Boris Green left in January 1983 to take up a permanent Head of Lower School post (scale 4), Simon was made Acting Head Boys Physical Education until Alex's arrival in April 1983. These temporary elevations were taken by Simon to indicate that he 'was on his way' in career terms. In February 1984 he expressed a concern to gain a permanent scale 2 in the pastoral system as soon as was possible with a view to breaking into this career avenue, perhaps with the possibility of being a Head of Physical Education on the way^a^9, before ending up fully on the pastoral side as a scale 3. This Head of Department position would, however, be overlooked if a scale 3 pastoral post came up sooner than expected, since he didn't want to
be in physical education for the rest of his life, plus there was a realisation that in the prevailing economic climate there were very few scale 2, Head of Boys becoming available both within the county and nationally.

Having had a scale 2 post for a period and having to return to a scale 1 in September 1983, was a deflating experience for Simon, he now felt he could 'do the job' and had 'proved' it, hence it was difficult to motivate himself to give so much energy to responsibilities on a scale 1 again. The gaining of a permanent scale 2 in the near future was seen as essential by him in terms of motivating himself to invest energy in the school system.

"It would just open everything up to me, it really would, it would give me a real incentive to do something again. Having done the job, it will just give me the incentive to get there. It's this status thing again I suppose, I'll be on a scale 2, and on that I can apply for 3's in P.E., or you can apply for 3's on the pastoral side. It just gives you that little bit of extra option, and the incentive to want to do something."

In September 1984 Simon was made Deputy Head of 1st Year on a permanent scale 2, and in 1986 definitely saw his career path as being in the pastoral system, with the aim to be a Head of Year as soon as possible. The inclinations to move out of physical education were reinforced by several injuries that Simon sustained in playing rugby. Firstly a shoulder injury which prevented him being able to demonstrate in lessons for two months, then in January 1986 a serious knee injury which prevented him playing the rest of the season whilst again causing problems for demonstrations in lessons, which were seen as a substantial threat to self esteem.
as Simon prided himself on his competence in a wide range of physical skills. The shift to the pastoral side gained greater significance in the light of these injuries, "especially if this knee carries on, but definitely within ten years I will be out of P.E. And this other thing is an important string to my bow". As the 'other string ', that is, his Deputy Head of Year post needed to have more energy invested in it, the commitment to the physical education department decreased, "I'll do as much as I have to with the teams, but not as much as I used to.".

As early as 1983 when Simon was becoming serious about adopting a pastoral career path, having made a large investment in terms of commitment within Branstown School, he was reluctant to move elsewhere, "I would like it to be here (a scale 2 post), because I don't really want to leave here at the moment, because the jobs just getting interesting, as I said you get to know the kids, and it seems, not ludicrous but sad to have to start all over again". In addition he had been able to make the physical education aspect of his career containable and less stressful and notes, "the P.E. side takes care of itself and I can concentrate on getting to grips with the pastoral side". Of great significance was that Simon remarried in April 1986 with his new wife Louise 4 months pregnant. A new house twenty miles from Branstown School meant an increased mortgage and additional travelling time and expense, and this coupled with the imminent arrival of the new baby helped shape Simon's conceptions of his future career. This is clearly indicated by his initial reluctance and eventual decision not to apply for a
Simon's concern to choose the most appropriate career path for his age and new family circumstances, was indicated by him approaching the Headmaster to gauge his opinion:

"Because I have gone to the pastoral side, but I am still doing a P.E. job, whether I was going in the right or wrong direction, whether I was watering it down by applying and not really feeling that much commitment to it. As much as you can make decisions for yourself, you still need other people to give you a view at least. And I haven't applied."

That he would have to 'start his pastoral career' all over again in terms of investing time and energy, as there was no element of this in the advertised post was a major reason given by Simon for not applying, that is, the new post would have been a disinvestment in his new career path. In addition he felt that his present Headmaster saw him in a positive light as far as his pastoral work was concerned, "in his eyes I'm fine." Likewise, Simon had invested a great deal of time and energy in creating a positive image (as defined by him) around the school which would be 'wasted' if he went to another school and had to start the process all over again.

"I've been here six years now so there is no more impressing to do. They have formed their image of me and I won't change that image now, happily it's a good one....... They know that they have got a Deputy Head of Year, who they have admitted quite happily can do the Head of Years job and supports the Head of Year in the school. I'm quite in, I'm alright."
Linked intimately with this awareness of 'being in' were the responsibilities that come with fatherhood, even though temporarily it would prevent progress in the career ladder. Plus there existed a strong image of a 'family man' who wanted to see his child grow up, and reference was made to the original Head of Physical Education in the school, Bill Rogers, who admitted to Simon that he never saw his two children grow up due to an over-commitment to physical education as a subject during his early years in teaching.

"The reason that I felt I had to think about the Millside job, it is a scale 3, that's nice, the money becomes dramatically different on a 3 and 4. A new school, I mean I have only ever taught in one, which isn't a very good thing. If I hadn't got lots of other things going on at the moment as well, it would be a nice juicy job to get into. Because you have got a Head of Boys, a Head of Girls, and one under in each, but the Head of P.E. is going to be overall Head. It does appeal, but I have got so much else going on at the moment, what with the baby, the house, that that's the last thing I want".

In September 1986, with the birth of his first child only a month away, Simon informed the researcher, "School is totally insignificant in my scheme of things at the moment". Previous to this he had made the definite decision to pursue a pastoral career within the confines of Branstown School, and he saw this redirection of commitment as reducing not only his efforts within physical education in general, but also the resistance he would offer to Alex in terms of questioning decisions over the physical education curriculum and its development as directed in the future. This was seen to coincide with Peter's new found enthusiasm in his position of Deputy in Charge of Timetable, which Simon felt essentially
reduced him as a threat to the innovations as well since he would now have to 'toe the party line'.

"I suppose my interest outside of P.E. means I have been less of a threat in that respect, and now Peter has got the incentive outside. He has now become, not less of a threat, but he is starting to put more back in, whereas he didn't do that before.".

"You can see where the balance of power, well not power, but how the balance has changed in P.E. Peter is taking on less and less P.E., and I'm more committed to the pastoral side I must admit because that's where I see myself going. So you can see what's going to happen, he'll end up with nobody disagreeing with him at all, I haven't got the time to be involved in all that now.".

The shift in the balance of power is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 14. It is evident with Simon that a subtle interplay of intrinsic, extrinsic and personal circumstances containing several critical incidents had brought about a reorientation within him to the innovations in the department, and to the subject as an entity in itself, as his subjective career map has altered over time, leading to a partial withdrawal as energies as side-bets were transferred to an alternative career pathway.

This reduction in commitment to the physical education department did not go unnoticed by Alex, and became a source of tension between the two teachers. In September 1986 Alex comments on Simon:

"Simon is becoming bone idle...He's strolling in that (his Deputy Head of Year job). He has not contributed any real work in the department for the last two years at all, he uses the excuse that he's busy with his year group...He's talking about not doing things when it comes around to having the baby, well he does sod all now so it won't make a difference."
This lack of commitment was epitomised for Alex by an incident at the start of the Autumn term 1986. Due to a restructuring of the 5th and 6th year options, Alex asked if everyone in the department would stay behind for a couple of hours after school to help with the paperwork, and all the department, including Simon, agreed to do so. However, on the night Simon informed Alex that he was busy and would it be acceptable if he did not stay behind. To Alex this was a typical action from Simon, and he was the only member of the department who did not help after school, and he notes, "The rest of the department noticed it, he was the only one not there, and they playfully reminded me of it." Alex now saw Simon as 'lazy' and 'opting out of physical education', and in terms of his recruitment of a department with a positive attitude towards his innovations up to this point he notes;

"We are carrying Simon really...he's not involved, he has no commitment, he is giving nothing, and that can't go on for too long.....I shall put it to him, that he has got to make a choice as to where he is going, because if he doesn't have at least some commitment to the department, then I'm not going to be able to support him in his applications for jobs as Head of Department."

Whilst not seen as a threat to the continuance of the innovations any more, Simon's reduction in commitment was seen to undermine the efforts of Alex to produce a visibly efficient and energetic department. By directing his energies outside of the department Simon was aware that he had begun to close off his options for a career path within physical education in which he would need the positive sanctions of his head of department.
The giving of time and energy is strategically diverted along different courses depending upon the prevailing short and long term interests of the individual. At Branstown School it was noticable how the staff attributed motives as to why commitment was given to one area as opposed to another within the school by teachers. This was particularly so in relation to Alex and his proposals for change, and had a direct bearing on the manner in which these teachers related to the innovations, and the emergent micropolitical 'solutions' that were constructed.

All the department recognised that Alex was 'ambitious' and was aiming to gain promotion either within the school, or move elsewhere to gain a scale 4. This was part of the taken for granted world of teaching of 'how to get on' in relation to the structure of career pathways. They also recognised him as an articulate figurehead able to impress the school hierarchy and negotiate for the improved status of the department, from which all would gain in terms of their own career progression. Recognising the capacity of Alex to enhance and verify their own side-bets in terms of career progression, the womans department and Jeremy were prepared to offer support to the innovations in terms of energy expenditure in the new system, and made some attempt (with the exception of Rachel) to translate the new ideas into their practice of teaching, even though this led at time to states of 'false clarity' and 'painful unclarity'. Alex was well aware that for these teachers
who aspired to promotion beyond Branstown School, that their support was in part because they had 'nothing to lose', and notes;

"Well, if you are going to get a foot on the career ladder, then it looks very good on your curriculum vitae to have been involved in something innovative. It's a gold star for them." 69

"Lots of people have been promoted out of this department, innovations been very good for them. 'Thanks very much chief - off I go' (laughs), and I'm still here (laughs). Although, it hasn't done my career any harm" 70

Simon and Peter continued to have strong reservations over the changes throughout the study, and admit that they have not changed their teaching practice at all. Their concern stemmed in part from their consideration that Alex and several others in the department were committed to change in order to facilitate their own career progressions, this being particularly so with Alex, leading them to the conception of 'change for changes sake'.

"He is very career orientated, extremely career orientated, in as much as he will get to the stage now where he will get bored with the department because there's nothing left to do. That's what worries me, that he will get bored, not with us as a group of people, but with the system that he has tagged onto, or made up. And I genuinely believe, O.K. there are some advantages I suppose, but literally every new idea that has come into the county has been sampled by Branstown at some point, and I think a lot of the ideas have been taken on because Alex wants to make a name for himself and get noticed, 'This is the school - we are going forward.'71.

That Alex was prepared to invest heavily in the innovation was indicated to his department by his efforts to introduce and maintain structural change in the curriculum. As he notes in considering a departmental meeting in January 1984 in which he knew he would have
to meet challenges from Peter and Simon concerning the practicalities of introducing specialist teachers for years 1-3.

"I've spent nights, days, and hours going through this with the chap in charge of the timetabling, to try and go through it to make sure it can work. It might mean that I will initially teach more lower school. I might not have the balance that I have had up to now.....So if anyone is going to be messed around it will have to be me because I've introduced the system. Well, it doesn't have to be me, but I am willing to lose my balance to let the system be introduced initially."72.

This willingness to invest in the innovation was also made evident to his department in his preparedness to take over the majority of educational gymnastics teaching in the first two years73, which was in part an attempt to deflect resistance from the men who felt less than competent to teach this area, but also confirmed his own commitment to the new system in the eyes of his staff. Such a high level of commitment was recognised by his staff, and Simon plus Peter felt that Alex must be 'gymnastics crazy' or 'had a lot to gain from causing havoc with the present system'74. That Alex appeared more knowledgeable about recent educational trends than his colleagues, that he spent more of his own time on reading the literature and getting prepared for departmental meetings, that he spent more time on courses and school committees, and talked more about the innovations, was a clear indication to the staff that Alex was highly committed to introducing changes, would let little stand in his way, and that possibly he had a great deal to gain in career terms from instigating curriculum innovations.
In terms of attributing motives for commitment the attempts to change at Branstown School were often portrayed in relation to a much publicised curriculum innovation at a nearby school called Longcliffe, where the Head of Department John Ashford, has stopped all school teams, opening the school on Saturday mornings on a 'sports centre' basis. Talking about Ashford's motives for this change which he saw as reflecting those of Alex, Simon notes;

"Because he wants to be an advisor. He's at the stage now where he could make advisor......He's carrying out the system that other people want him to try. He's being used as an example 'this is what Longcliffe are doing'. It gets him in the news, if you want to call it that, but at least people have noticed him and are talking about him. I can see what he's doing and where he thinks he's going."75

Peter also saw Alex's attempts at innovation in the same light, and early in 1984 comments;

"I reckon that Alex is going to be leaving. I don't know if he is all that committed to the P.E. department. He's looking already to get into something else......I get the impression that he's not into staying here very long, and he's after moving into something higher."75

Monica and Catherine also realised that introducing innovations to the department would get Alex noticed and help advance his career, but saw this as a legitimate strategy in terms of the history of the department, plus they felt that involvement in innovation would be beneficial for their own careers. Simon saw all the innovations as motivated by a desire for promotion and doubted if such changes would have been made if Alex was on a scale 4. This form of rationalisation was used to 'explain' Alex's 'over-involvement' which according to Smith and Kieth(1971) involves working above and
beyond the call of duty. Unlike Kensington School the staff at Branstown never classified Alex as a fanatic, merely that at times he was guilty of 'overselling' the innovative ideas. As House (1974) notes:

"When this happens non-believers begin to focus on the gap between promises made for the innovation and its performance, and begin to label its protagonists as medicine men or charlatans." (House, 1974, p86)

Whilst not claiming that Alex was a charlatan, during the course of the study, Simon and Peter in particular, began more and more to question the sincerity of his motives. The main focus was upon what Alex articulated verbally with regards to the change, and the ongoing actions of the department, as an example, Simon felt it was inconsistent for Alex to promote all the 'so called changes', yet still be prepared to join up with Simon's group for a couple of lessons in the summer term to play a softball game, since if he was sincere about his views then he would have them all in small sided games based on individual practices?". In addition, Alex had made no direct 'attack' on the way either Simon or Peter taught, which was seen by these teachers as strange since it was the opposite of what Alex desired and claimed was the 'right' way of teaching when discussing it in the public arena. By September 1986 Simon was convinced that Alex was using the innovations to further his own career aspirations and was definitely on a 'bandwagon', since for the first three Fridays of the term he had been absent from school attending courses, which for Simon "all fitted into place, he wants to get noticed by the advisors"/e
Clearly, commitment to schooling, the department, the subject, and the innovation is not a unitary phenomenon, nor is it unidirectional. It is instead, multidirectional with certain avenues emerging as dominant in certain periods depending upon the interaction of other intruding incidents in the individual's life circumstances. The ebb and flow of Simon's commitment in terms of time and energy being a sound example, in which his initial resistance to the innovation was high in 1983, but by 1986 was greatly reduced as was his involvement in physical education as a subject. The innovations as proposed by Alex were not related to in a social vacuum, but were defined and judged in relation their possible effects on the individual and their future development both inside and outside the school.

Commitment was conceived of in different ways by the physical educators, and its articulation in the form of 'caring' was used to create an image of each of the perspectives in the department as more caring than the other. This imputed 'uncaring' was to strike at a central aspect of the teacher's self which claims to itself a positive concern for children. From within the extremes of the sporting perspective, as held by Peter and Simon, this caring concern was made manifest in relation to the more able pupils, whilst for the others in the department it related to the less able. Importantly such caring was predominantly in operation during contact with pupils, that is, in the classroom context of the school,
and its lack of utility in promoting the individual teacher in the educational context places greater importance upon the other strands of commitment that have been revealed for achieving goals in this context.

The categories of career continuance, investment of time and energy, and occupational competence, indicate dramatically the teacher as 'economist' in which the innovation is assessed in relation to each teachers' long and short term self interests in terms of task, career and, extramural concerns. There is an essential instrumentality in adopting an innovative idea which is based on the notion of rewardingness for the teacher in which the benefits of adoption need to outweigh the costs. These aspects of commitment are often located in the educational context of the school, and allegiance to an innovation creates the 'image' of innovative teacher, which is seen as beneficial for career advancement. It is also an important indicator of occupational competence, along with attendance on in-service courses, which also acts to facilitate promotion within the education system, particularly for those aspiring to positions beyond Branstown School. However, rhetorical acceptance of an innovation does not necessarily mean that there will be any change in teaching practice, as is made clear in Chapter 16.

Time and energy expenditure were seen as intimately linked to the acceptance of the innovations, which highlighted the career prioritization of the teachers involved. For Peter and Simon, the
innovation was seen as a high cost and low reward situation within their sporting perspective, since it would involve a large energy expenditure into a system which would be unable to meet their needs, and the destruction of the present system geared towards the production of successful school teams, which was created to maintain the interests of those holding this perspective. Critical incidents for both these individuals affected their resistance to the innovation as each began to seek and develop career opportunities outside of physical education, which in effect began to close off such opportunities in this area itself. Importantly all the others in the department saw their futures in physical education and the innovation was viewed as a sound investment for career gains. In terms of negotiating a subjective career path it appears that the individual will orientate him/herself to the group or system most able to meet their immediate and predicted self interests and needs.

The attribution of motives to the innovation is particularly illuminating since it allows insights into how teachers interpret other teachers involvement in activities in school. That is, high levels of commitment are seen to be instrumental in achieving some goal, with the goals most often being defined in terms of career continuance and not occupational competence or caring. Should such high commitment not be rewarded, then then individuals are likely to reinvest and redirect their energies to areas where other redefined goals are attainable. In this sense the proposed innovations of Alex were a commodity to be utilised to assist in the attainment of individual and group goals within the social context of the school,
and this utilisation is made clearer in the following chapters as other emergent concerns of the physical educators in relation to the innovations are made evident.
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CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONTROL AND ACHIEVEMENT
Since teachers operate in loco parentis their rights and duties are taken to be the same as that of parents to their children, and Barrell (1975) illustrates how the law sanctions the exercise of discipline within tolerable bounds. The law also provides an official mandate for control, as Stenhouse (1967b) points out:

"The teacher is sent into the classroom with a legitimate power and authority, vested in him by society through legislation and through custom. This authority carries with it a responsibility to exercise some control over the class." (Stenhouse, 1967b, p. 47)

Concerns over control have been expressed by H.M.I.'s, who in their 1982 Report claimed that twenty five percent of the new teachers observed were not adequately prepared for the job when they entered the profession. A major criticism related to the preparation of newcomers to deal with matters of classroom organisation, management and control.

"Characteristics most commonly associated with lessons of low quality included......poor relationships and class control, particularly in the secondary schools, whereas occasionally these seriously inhibited the teaching and rendered meaningless any comment on other aspects." (H.M.I., 1982, p. 23)

An additional fear relating to control in schools for the teachers concerned is the possibility of legal action. The Health and Safety at Work Act of 1974, makes it clear that action may be taken
against a teacher if an accident could be attributed to negligence in exercising control.

Besides these pressures from outside of school there are some which are much more immediate, the most obvious group being that of children who have an expectation to be controlled. Those pupils that Rosser and Harre (1976) considered, felt "insulted by weakness on the part of those in authority who they expect to be strong, and this weakness once established, provokes more playing up" (p38). Likewise, Furlong (1976) found that the most important distinction children made amongst teachers was their ability to keep order, if teachers were categorized as 'strict' they were taken seriously, if 'soft' then they were played up. Even those children who resist the most, expect in the end to be controlled', and being controlled and learning to come to terms with this is a central feature of children's school experience. However, as Denscombe (1985) notes;

"...this does not mean that pupils will always be supportive of the teachers' efforts to establish classroom control. Without defying the laws of logic, pupils can dislike being controlled and where possible, take active steps to undermine the teachers' efforts to obtain control, yet at the same time, they can (and generally do) expect teachers to overcome such resistance and reserve respect for those teachers who can impose order on the situation even against the resistance they themselves might put up." (Denscombe, 1985, p33)

Other teachers also expect a colleague to be able to exert and maintain control, indeed it is central to 'being' a 'good' teacher. As Haig (1979) notes;

"Control the class, then teach is a common theme passed on from one teaching generation to another, with the accompanying notion
that the teacher who cannot control never gets to the point of being able to teach." (Haig, 1979, p7)

In a similar fashion at Branstown School Simon claimed that, "If you can get rid of the discipline problems you can actually teach, that's why they say in theory that it's far easier to teach in a Public school." To not 'teach' is not to 'be' teacher, and therefore any teacher who is unwilling or unable to establish control in the classroom is not likely to succeed in teaching and will be categorised according to Harland (1975) as a 'poor' teacher. Alex noted that promotion in the career structure is dependent upon this ability "You would never get to Head of Department anyway if you didn't have the necessary teaching skills and control because you wouldn't be promoted lower down,".

Control then becomes an imperative, and it is the ability to control not the willingness on which teachers are judged. Rachel gained her post at Branstown School because it was felt that in view of the groups that the it was known the probationer would have to take in her first year, she would be most able to gain control, and Monica noted that her nearest rival at interview, "would just break under the pressure.". Sadly on being promoted out of the department in September 1986 Rachel had still not made evident her ability to control and was classed as a 'poor' teacher. As Alex comments;

"I mean Rachel can't manage people to save her life. She is totally unable to control a class. She's not too bad with first and second years, but even there she has problems, with the older kids she has no control at all, they walk all over her. In that sense she can't teach, not in a school like ours where if you don't have control life can be hell."
Talk relating to the 'individual' control problems of teachers was noticeable by its absence in the department, and Comber and Whitfield (1979) in a survey of teachers noted their reticence in admitting any discipline problems plus, "the stigma attached to not being able to keep order" (p10), it is at times literally an 'unspeakable' problem. It is not surprising that classroom control is a central concern for teachers, and Delamont (1983) estimates that at least twenty five percent of teacher talk in classrooms is directed explicitly towards discipline and control as opposed to lesson content per se. Even in 'free' schools control remains central, as it does with the apparently less structured 'guided discovery' methods in science. The pervasiveness of the concern for control lies at the heart of what Denscombe (1985) describes as the 'Hidden Pedagogy'. This is;

"An implicit set of assumptions about the aims of teaching and the methods of achieving them which, whilst certainly understood and practiced by teachers, rarely becomes articulated into something with the status of a theory of teaching. It is a common-sense knowledge of the job that underpins successful teaching but one which is not usually given much credence in philosophical or theoretical considerations of the job. This common sense knowledge of the job......exists prior to, and independent of formal pedagogies, especially in terms of classroom control, it comes from a very different source - classroom experience." (Denscombe, 1985, p53)

This Hidden Pedagogy contains certain wisdoms about survival in class and guidelines that demarcate practical competence as a teacher from practical incompetence. Critical to this categorization is the belief that control is absolutely necessary for successful teaching, which is made evident in practice, and does not therefore
depend upon the acceptance of some sort of theoretically supported pedagogy which locates classroom control amongst a variety of related aims and methods. With the exception of Alex, the physical educators saw little relevance and linkage between educational theory and actual practice, and Rachel felt that the 'educational theory' input of her college course was of little use to her in the classroom, whilst Jeremy was critical of academic institutions in general for being 'utopian', and arranging lessons where all the pupils were keen and motivated, with plenty of equipment available, and no discipline problems, claiming "it's simply not like that in reality". What was useful for Jeremy were those sessions at college on 'teacher craft' which gave 'hard and fast' tips on how to survive in class. Such views are explicitly reinforced on entry into teaching, and Jeremy was told by the Head of Department at his teaching practice school to 'forget all that theory you learnt in college, this is the real world'.

This Hidden Pedagogy may be interpreted in its most basic form as a pragmatic response to the variety of classroom and institutional pressures encountered by the teacher in the school as a work place, which has as its ultimate aim practical usefulness in coping with these pressures, hence it may lack any coherence and logical consistency. Various coping strategies have been identified which appear to be consistently used by teachers and these are dealt with in part in the later chapters on micropolitics. The main point to be made here is that they arise to combat the informal pressures
of the school as a work place, that is, they are shaped and emerge from the social context of the school. As Leacock (1969) notes;

"Teachers cannot simply interact with the children in their classrooms according to their desires and personal style. Instead their behaviour often takes on characteristics beyond their immediate aims or intents. They must adapt their style, not only to the children, but to the institution, to the principal's requirements, to the other teachers' attitudes and to the standards according to which they are evaluated." (Leacock, 1969, p202)

Control (in its various forms) is a context specific phenomenon, and the school organization is the most significant factor shaping the immediate context. Shifts in school organization, as in changing half-year games to mixed ability tutor groupings, has important implications for control, and this became a significant influence on the reception of the proposed curriculum changes at Branstown School by the physical educators.

(11.2) DOMINATING CHILDREN.

All the physical educators were in no doubt that they as teachers had to control children in lessons. Rachel, Simon and Peter saw control as a central aspect of the physical educators role in the school, as Peter notes "Discipline is still the major thing that a P.E. man needs."14. However, Jeremy recognised the 'historical' link between his subject and control, in that the "P.E. master was the disciplinarian. Usually you didn't mess about in 'sirs' lesson, but you messed about in French and things like that"15, yet he rejected this aspect of his role and attempted to play down the 'hard man' image that Boris Green had built up for the pupils about Jeremy.
when he introduced him to them, and in doing so indicates his moderate position within the sporting perspective.

"Perhaps we are looked on as the discipline centre of the school, I don't like that aspect of it. I think that it is necessary to have good discipline over here because of the safety aspect really. I think that it's grown up that you don't get away with anything over in the sports hall because they are 'hard men' over there. I think that breeds resentment, and that you lose a large percentage of the kids who just switch off.....I think that you can get on well enough by being firm rather than going over the top.......When I first started here there were some kids that were really in fear of me.......I had to try and play that down." 

In establishing control at Branstown School the formal school rules were rarely referred to, 'informal' rules predominated which were much more localised than the former. Such informal rules were seen to be context specific, operating in particular classrooms, at particular times, with particular groups of pupils, for example, 1st year pupils evoked a different form of control than 4th years. Hence, for the physical educators, circumstances dictated the relaxation or tightening up of teacher definitions of acceptable classroom behaviour, with different interpretations calling for changes of approach in response to changing circumstances. These informal rules, besides being context specific were also personal in that they differed from teacher to teacher, who constructed different lines of negotiation with the pupils involved in the interaction. Several of the teachers spoke of 'drawing the line' early on with pupils, and this imposition of teacher definition led to 'domination' strategies characterised by impersonal command techniques which were particularly evident with those holding the
extremes of the sporting perspective. Peter, talking on the advice he would give a new teacher notes;

"I would always tell him that if he really wanted to do well, the first thing that you have got to establish is your discipline in the class......Make sure they know exactly what they have got to do, what they wear, and they don't try anything on. Once you've got the discipline kids tend to respond much better." 18

Simon, whose teaching in class was characterised by a direct authoritarian 'command' style, was given similar advice when he started teaching and was now prepared to propogate this aspect of the Hidden Pedagogy to others entering the profession.

"The first thing that I was told as a tip, and I would tell anyone else, and it's one thing.....that in the first six months in the school where you are new to the kids and they are new to you.....then you are a bastard for six months. Then anything you give after that is not a softening, because they have seen what you are like, and then anything that happens is a step forward, or a start of a relationship. The kids bloody hated me, but it meant that any problems you were going to get you were going to have out of the way at that time. I mean my relationships now with the kids is very good." 19

For Simon the major aim of his early lessons with pupils, above all else, was to establish himself as critical reality definer. Talking about a first year rugby group he had taken that morning he notes;

"I'd like to think that as far as anything else, that they've learnt what I want them to do, they've enjoyed it, then I can get the kids back where I want them. That's the most important thing at the end of the day, because you want the kids to have respect for you." 20

This applied even in the more 'free' and less 'structured' lessons of educational gymnastics. In a first lesson with 1st year pupils he wanted them, "to just go away with a certain sense of discipline in
terms of what I expect of them as a first lesson. I'd rather the lesson was harder and not very ed-gymish, so that they know how far they can really go, and they know where the line is.\textsuperscript{21}. Whilst not claiming such an extreme approach, Monica on becoming Head of Girls saw as her first essential task the 'tightening up of discipline within the womans' department\textsuperscript{22}. Discipline was an important part of her lessons, and once again the 'line' was drawn early on.

"Certainly discipline wise it's very strict I'd say now, certainly in the beginning, always with first years. I'm very traditional, I like that sort of atmosphere. After you have got the discipline sorted out, then you can have the jokes, and we have plenty of those with the children." \textsuperscript{23}

Researcher observations indicated that this control line was flexible, and this flexibility was dependent upon individualised knowledge of children in the group, which was a time dependent factor. As Simon notes;

"So you are very aware after you build up your knowledge of who the kids are and this kind of thing, what they are about.....Some you can't afford to have a laugh and a joke with, and it's nice to know which ones you can and which ones you can't. That saves you all the hassle in the world, there's no problem then." \textsuperscript{24}

In a similar fashion Jeremy felt that there was a;

"...strong case for picking and choosing your styles with different groups. That's down to knowing the kids you are teaching. I feel that I now approach different groups in different ways, simply because of the behaviour problem or intelligence basically\textsuperscript{25}

Within this personal knowledge the physical educators defined a 'good' pupil as one who would accept control, would have a 'laugh'
but knew where the 'line' was. Catherine felt that humour was a part of her teaching style, yet was aware that she often rapidly redefined the situation when needed, "but if it all goes too far you can always call it back. The good kids never take it too far."[26] She was also aware of the personalised nature of control in that different members of the department tolerated certain aspects of behaviour more readily than she did, and these personalised informal rules are made evident in the following comments, firstly by Catherine, then Jeremy;

"I think by being a strict disciplinarian when I arrived. I mean I still am. I have in my mind certain standards, the way I want this done. For example, if I call a register I expect it to be done in silence. I expect high standards of kit, and if I'm talking nobody else talks unless I give permission. In the gym they sit up straight when I am talking to them, and not slouch."[27]

"Yes, they know what's expected of them.....I can only speak for myself. I think that I have got through to them, and they know how to behave in my lessons."[28]

It was recognised that defining and enforcing these personalised informal rule structures was extremely costly in terms of time and energy, but such an investment was crucial for continued teacher survival in school, since it set the boundaries for the pupils of tolerable and acceptable behaviour in future lessons.

(11.3) STRESS REDUCTION AND THE CREATION OF ROUTINE.

At the three schools in his study Denscombe(1985) felt that teacher strategies aimed at control shared two main aims. Firstly, to reduce the teachers' reliance on personal charisma as the means for gaining
control, and secondly, to minimize the level of uncertainty which is inherent in classroom proceedings. In a working environment characterised by, multidimensionality, simultaneity, and unpredictability, routine is essential in stress reduction.

At Branstown School the teachers attempted to introduce routine to the pupils as soon as they came to the department for the first time. At the start of the Autumn term the first lesson was spent 'introducing' the new intake of first years to the department. Boys and girls went to opposite ends of the sports hall and the whole period was then taken up with a reading of the 'riot act' as it was known, that is, the unwritten rules of what can and cannot be done by the children in lessons and in and around the department area, the consequences for misbehaviour, and the rituals of giving in valuables, showering, changing and kit etc. Routinisation in this sense is a form of domination strategy similar to Andy Hargreaves (1979) 'policing' and Webb's (1962) 'drill sergeant', since it relies on rigid order imposed in an authoritarian manner, with a view to minimising the prospect of uncertainty and confusion in the classroom and around the department, enabling the teacher to exert control in a potentially 'hostile' environment.

Several of the teachers saw teaching as a 'battle' or 'struggle'. Rachel having had the Headmaster watch her teach 4th year basketball in which she was obviously tense, was told by him that being nervous with such a group was beneficial otherwise they would
'walk all over her'32. Being with a class of children for Rachel in her probationary year was anxiety inducing in itself:

"Because you can't relax for a minute. Maybe I'm wrong, but I tend to feel that if you relax at all, they'll jump on it especially early on." 32

Monica also expressed a concern that due to the compulsory nature of the subject she had to deal with many obstreperous pupils, which meant "you battle on, and you battle through, and eventually one wins"33. Simon too spoke of "children taking advantage" if control was relaxed34. Teaching for all the physical educators was seen as an activity that was potentially stressful; particularly if control went astray during a lesson. This fear was made evident by Rachel in comparing herself to the rest of the department whom she saw as having very good control which she wished to emulate;

"I'll sort of have that fear that I might lose control of the lesson, whereas they don't have that fear. They would probably concentrate more on achieving an actual skill, and not be so concerned......Whereas, I'll perhaps think 'Oh God - they're sitting down too long, perhaps I'd better get them moving'. Or they are starting too talk 'Oh dear - what do I do next?', that sort of thing, whereas they are 'Right, that's it (snaps fingers) get on.' 36

It was such mundane 'disruptive behaviours'36 as talking, inactivity, bouncing a basketball during teacher talk, and not paying attention, which presented control problems at Branstown School, and needed to be eradicated by routine. There were no violent incidents involving staff within the school during the time that the researcher spent in the school, but there was an awareness of such incidents at some of
the 'harder' school in Big City. In relation to control Catherine notes the benefits of routine for her:

"When you go in first, when you first take a class, then you set down those sort of things (personal teacher rules), and it pays off dividends, because then they know and you can pick them up a week or a year later." 37

Rachel was also learning the stress reduction benefits of routine in her first term of teaching:

"I can say to the 4th years, 'You've forgotten your gym shoes, what does that mean?', 'Twenty minutes detention miss', 'Right-O.K.'. They clearly know what is expected of them, which probably helps because they know what they are aiming for, and it's less hassle for us to keep explaining things." 38

"I think that once they have got the routine, of getting changed, do this, coming out and having a shower, do that. Then once they have got the routine established, you don't have to exercise it because they'll automatically come in and do it." 39

For the physical educators routines relied upon informal rule, ritual, and regimentation, which left little interactional space for pupil hostility and resistance to become manifest, plus it kept the institutional authority of the teacher intact and relatively unchallenged. As Woods(1979) has pointed out, this routinization can be useful in its own right, "Routine imposes a structure on school life which pupils and teachers automatically come to accept"(p162). Routines then become embedded in the consciousness of those involved, and become part of the taken for granted reality of classroom life for both teacher and pupil. In addition routine and ritual enhance the teachers ability to cover syllabus material in lessons which is related to achievement criteria, and is very much to do with the low technical resources and materials available to
teachers since this makes them rely heavily on man-management
techniques to achieve control, which is itself dependent upon
personalised authority and personal commitment. Shifts in
organizational structure may break routine creating a greater
reliance on personalised authority and demanding increased personal
commitment, both of which add to the daily stress of teaching, that
is, the innovations were seen to undermine the routinised control
that the teachers in the department had established over time, and
were not welcomed by several of the department at Branstown School
since it had the potential to increase the stress of their working
day. These fears are made evident in the following sections.

(11.4) EDUCATIONAL GYMNASTICS AS A DESTRUCTURING ENVIRONMENT AND
POTENTIAL STRESSOR.

One of the consequence of Alex's proposals for change was that the
men would have to teach educational gymnastics for a specified
period during the year (the women already taught this in their
curriculum), which was seen as threatening by the men since their
initial training had not prepared them to teach this subject well,
plus it presented them with an 'unstructured environment' which in
their eyes could, and would, lead to control problems. Having some
form of created structure in which pupils could be contained was
important to the teachers and was often justified in terms of
'childrens' needs', as Jeremy claimed;

"Kids have got to have aims. They have got to have something to
aim for, because if I went in there with that group this morning
(a swimming class) and said, 'O.K. lads - you have got a free
lesson now and I am just going to sit here and watch you'. Initially they would think 'Great. - marvellous'. The first five minutes they would really be enjoying it, but after that they would look for some sort of guidance. I can only speak for what I have seen with kids, and how I felt at that age. They want to be, not organised and regimented, but at least directed somehow, because they are very young. They can't think for themselves, and they like to be given tasks to do, and they can work within that framework. they know they can do so much, and if they go beyond that mark, then they are in trouble. Just so they have got rules to go by." 40

The department were in general agreement with this view, as Peter notes "I reckon they get more out of a disciplined approach. I'm sure that in the end they would rather have it, because in the end they would know rather more where they are." 41, and Simon agreed that children found 'freedom' difficult to handle. 42 In relation to this the males in the department found the changes threatening because it meant they had to teach educational gymnastics, a subject area in which they had little experience of teaching, and which they saw as lacking in structure for both themselves and the pupils, which was stress inducing since it was by definition more difficult to routinise. As Simon comments:

"I think that I'll enjoy most of the stuff I do, although I don't ever teach educational gymnastics in the purest sense. I don't like it, because it's not maybe me. I don't like the open ended stuff, I don' like allowing the kids too many freedoms within the confines of a lesson to do what they want. I'm very much that kind of personality. I'd rather have the security of knowing 'this is what we are doing', and try to structure it so as to restrict it to that." 43

The open ended nature of educational gymnastics increased the level of uncertainty for Simon, which he could not routinise within that frame, so a familiar frame was introduced leading to the lesson being teacher directed and highly structured. Peter facing a similar
problem simply chose not to teach educational gymnastics at all, even when timetabled to do so. He felt happier with the more formalised structure of Olympic Gymnastics, and notes;

"I think that they will stretch themselves far more in an orderly situation, a structured situation, where they know that they are going to do a headspring or whatever. I think that they will get more out of that......because you are leading them, telling them what they have got to do, and I think that the more able kids get more out of it. I think also that the less able get more out of it as well." 44

That educational gymnastics was stress inducing for these teachers is made evident by Jeremy:

"But when it came to the crunch and you had to do ed gym, Oh dear, you really felt uneasy about it....I think they (the pupils) can sense, they are very perceptive. They can sense whether you are interested in it or not, and it comes through, 'Oh, what are we doing now?'. They get very uninterested, and that worried me, because that's the first time it ever happened. Obviously kids get switched off, but at least you can do something to bring them back into it, but I couldn't think of anything in ed gym. I was very weak at it." 45

Competence concerns are made evident here in addition to the stress caused by not being able to react spontaneously to unexpected incidents which led to these teachers not feeling in control of self or pupils, creating tensions and anxieties during these lessons. Educational gymnastics as a subject emphasises the uniqueness of the pupils, and since they cannot be 'hidden' in the rapid flow of a team game activity, this serves to heighten the inherent uncertainty surrounding events and situations in the gymnasium for those not experienced in this environment. In such a situation Simon and Peter in particular attempted to enforce a high degree of structure, once again introducing routine into their lessons to standardise the
external environment. This needs to be contrasted with Alex who found the educational gymnastics environment the most enjoyable and rewarding in terms of self expression to work in having gained a great deal of experience in this activity during his career. However, even with his idealist perspective there was once again a concern for structure and outcome in relation to environmental stability which Alex felt was inherent in educational gymnastics. He notes;

"In individual activities. I find that in gymnastics, I would say that in pair and individual work, you can centre on all those educational aims, and you can see it happening more. I think that in team games, there are certain things that you can put over...but children are able to drift away from it, avoid the direct situation you are trying to put them in, and they can avoid the direct experience that you are trying to put them in. Whereas in an individual activity, even though the task may be 'open', you can direct them more on individual tasks towards the outcomes."47

In such a situation Alex still maintained control, since here he felt the environment to be more stable that the games field environment which he found difficult to structure, the opposite of the other men in the department.

(11.5) MIXED ABILITY GROUPS AS POTENTIAL STRESSORS.

The major resistance within the department against mixed-ability grouping for games came from Simon and Peter in particular, yet it was symptomatic of the problems and concerns the rest of the staff had with this new arrangement. In the 'top group' situation the physical education specialist always took this 'elite' group, and the less able were allocated to non-specialists to often do with as they
wished. Control with a top-group was relatively easy since they were
defined as highly motivated and able pupils who did not cause
'problems', hence they were seen as a 'perk' in a hectic working week
in which the teacher could afford to relax.

In contrast, poorly motivated low ability pupils were defined as
problematic since they consumed a great deal of teacher time and
energy for little visible return in terms of performance outcomes.
Streaming via the 'top group' removed such pupils from contact with
the physical educators during games lessons. The restructuring of
the curriculum meant that they now had to teach mixed ability in
the games lessons which would include contact with these low
ability pupils, and this in itself was highly stressful as Jeremy
indicates;

"It's easier to teach, my God it's easier to teach (top-groups).
In the first year we teach rugby in P.E. which I find is the
most difficult lesson of the week by far because it's mixed
ability. You have got three or four kids who are good and who
are going to get into the team, and the rest not so skilful,
it's very very difficult to cope and control a group like that."

Simon felt that mixed ability games lessons would introduce control
problems by directly weakening the production of school teams and
potential team players, since these pupils were seen as important by
him in maintaining classroom control in general;

"They are always the nucleus you look for in your lessons to
work for you.....Then you've got thirty in a group, so you look to
those (team players) for your responsible attitudes and
everything else to ensure that you get over what you want."
With reference to the third year in which there were several difficult groups, he notes;

"Christ! some of the 3rd year groups are far easier to teach now because you have got kids in there who are in your teams or whatever. It isn't to do with whether you are a good rugby or soccer school. It goes right the way down through the years, the kids are better behaved, so why throw it all away?"  50

For both Peter and Simon mixed ability was 'not worth the hassle', the 'top group' was the ideal vehicle for meeting their needs within their sporting perspective. As Simon notes;

"If you have got the possibility of having the elite, all the best ones there, and you can get in and teach well to a good standard to your team or whatever. I don't see anything against getting in there and teaching it like that. I don't see why you should make the hassle for yourself of teaching like you have to in mixed ability."  51

"I mean I enjoy teaching top-groups, it's far easier to control and motivate them."  52

Likewise, Peter claimed that mixed ability groups created problems for control and motivation. There was also a general concern amongst those holding the sporting perspective for the effects on the more able pupils in such groups, it was claimed that in 'reality' the teacher often pitched the lesson at the level of the 'middle band', and since this did not cater for low and high ability pupils discipline problems could arise from these ends of the spectrum. As Simon put it "that's the worrying thing, because the top ones are the ones that usually don't muck around."  53. Disruptive behaviour was expected from low ability pupils, but the introduction of a system which induced or created the conditions for this with high ability pupils was seen to add to the dimension of stress already contained
in the teaching week. Another stressor was mentioned, and that was the size of the group, which would increase once the tutor group system was introduced, as Simon notes:

"I can see the problem next year, when the ratio has got to go up. We are teaching twenty eight kids now. Christ! that could be thirty two or thirty three kids next year or something. It just could take it over the top there. It doesn't sound a lot, but those few extra can cause problems, well not problems really, but they are just hassle you can do without." 54

Small teaching groups, particularly if they were able and motivated, were seen as 'time outs' in a stressful working week, as Simon notes, "The thought of having a small group. You look at your weekly timetable and think, 'that's nice, I've got a small group'. Well that won't be there next year." 55. All the teachers had 'favourite' groups, which had as their central defining character that they did not create control problems and allowed the teacher to 'relax'. These acted as significant 'psychic rewards' in the working week, and Monica admits that the timetable before the arrival of Alex was often constructed with this in mind.

"This is stupid, it's not for professional reasons, but things like 'frees'. We engineered it so that the woman always had one particularly nice day, particularly when the 5th years went. This was very important for morale reasons, moral fibre as it were. You felt you knew you had a 'good' day coming." 56

Such manipulation became impossible for Monica from 1983 onwards since Alex had gained total control of the curriculum57, and the new system which he proposed was seen by some to reduce the chances of having such 'good' days. Several were concerned that, unlike the year-games where disruptive pupils could be dissipated amongst three or
four groups on a 'divide and rule' basis, with the new system disruptive pupils would be able to stick together, and if they were in one tutor group then the teacher had to see this group twice a week, in games and physical education.

"There has got to be one or two classes that every teacher, if they are going to be honest with themselves, dread seeing ONCE a week. Perhaps not dread, but you don't like it, because they are not maybe 'nice' kids. Now when you have got to see every tutor group twice a week, from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, I'm wondering if you will put as much into it as you do now. At least in games you have got a refreshing mixture of kids there."  

In the above statement Simon indicates that his level of commitment to classroom teaching may be reduced with the introduction of the new system, and confided that having worked with it for two years in 1986, that it was a major contributing factor to his decision to devote his energies to the pastoral system in terms of career advancement. The introduction of the tutor-group system for games was therefore problematic since it reduced the effectiveness of the routines that the physical educators had invested a great deal of time and energy in constructing with children, their concerns with this system were in this sense predominantly related to control at the classroom level.

(11.6) CONTROL AS AN ASPECT OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT ROLE.

For Alex there was another dimension of control related to his proposals for curriculum change, which involved the control of staff within his department. He accepted that part of his role was
'disciplining' staff, however, this went against the view of himself as a 'democratic' leader who 'asked' rather than 'told' staff what to do without being seen as "easy meat". Directly reprimanding his staff was seen as particularly stressful, "I've only had to tell three people off, and I hate it, I hate having to tell people off...but when it comes I'll do it". The ability to 'man-manage' was seen as central to his role by him and he was aware that his staff had certain expectations with regard to his control over them.

"They must have respect for you in one way or another....The basic things they expect of me. They like me to administer all the paper work, or hand out all the paper work. The one side expect me to discipline and talk to the other side. The girls expect me to cater for the things that they see as bad in the men, what the men are doing wrong......and not 'telling off' but dealing with other members of staff within the department who they feel are not pulling their weight, or not doing something right. That is the first thing they see in me, and if they can see that I can, not discipline, but deal with those people, then it's easier to work with them for me."  

This form of control was acceptable outside the classroom, but due to the centrality of teacher 'autonomy' Alex could not gain direct control over the teachers in this area. This however, became essential for him once he realised, in the Autumn term of 1983 that little if any gymnastics was being taught by the men. "It was timetabled, but it was easy to get out of, because you are manipulated on areas", and the men were utilising gymnastics time for more rugby. Alex notes;

"There were people opting out. There was no way that I could get along to the lessons to find out. The only way I found out is when kids come along to my lessons and say they haven't done any. So I've told them now that they have to do gymnastics."
Informal control was necessary over the curriculum and was influential in Alex's decision to restructure the curriculum, "So I wanted more structure, I wanted to impose within the system the point that they had to teach gymnastics." This imposition came with the introduction of tutor-groupings for all activities, allowing four indoor facilities and two outdoor facilities to be available at any one time, and the staff had to negotiate with Alex for the use of these areas.

"But I will timetable the facilities, then it's up to the individual teacher, because within this structure I can get as close as possible to how I want it. Then it's up to the individual teacher to say 'O.K. I'll take that group, you take that one'. I'm going to timetable the facilities. They will have to timetable from the syllabus of work. I want them to cover as many of them as possible and not go over them unless it's impossible to do it, unless they have been timetabled for that facilities twice. It will also enable us to decide when we do rugby or cross-country. Whether you have an indoor facility early or later in the year." 

Alex admits that by making himself the focal point for the organization of the facilities he gained control over what the teachers had to cover, and removed their ability not to teach gymnastics, but that he still had no control over how they taught it, which remained a critical factor in teacher autonomy. The tutor-group system was also seen by Alex to act as a destabiliser to the previous system of elite school teams, which he felt would assist him in gaining control of teacher action and commitment in curriculum time.

"The argument against this system (elite school teams) is...how it impinges on the curriculum, and what they are doing in the day to day running of the school, and at the moment it impinges upon the curriculum in teaching time. It impinges on the curriculum time in the amount of time they spend in telephone
calls arranging matches, that they could be spending on other things. It could be spent thinking about their next lesson." 

By undermining the elite system Alex felt teachers would commit more 'thought' to curriculum lessons, although the evidence presented in later chapters suggests otherwise, as the classroom context and educational context became divorced in relation to the innovations. An additional means of informal control is the 'gatekeeper' effect the head of department can have in teachers' attempts to gain promotion. In 1983 Alex felt that if he could gain a scale point for Simon he would have more control over his teaching performance and get more work out of him in terms of commitment to the department. In discussing several managerial and administrative errors Simon had made with the inter-school fixtures he notes;

"I can sit him down, and I've told him, but I can't lean on him anymore.....I feel conscious that I can tell them (the department) off and take responsibility off them, but I can't go to them too much because they are not really being paid for what they are doing. He's not being paid to take on all those extra responsibilities. I could ask him to take on even more."

Hence, linked to the desire to gain more scale points for the department was the desire to control the behaviour and performance of others, and this, coupled with the structural changes in the curriculum that Alex proposed may be seen as a direct attempt by him to gain some form of control over his staff in terms of subject paradigm. An attempt was made to influence the content of the curriculum initially, which itself formed a central aspect of his strategy to reorientate the members of his department towards his idealist perspective in the curriculum.
Control over the school environment beyond lesson time was seen as important by the department for stress reduction, and was maintained by 'efficient organization' of facilities and equipment. Peter and Simon in particular felt that Alex had ignored these vital aspects of his role as 'newly arrived' head of department. Simon claimed that Alex should have spent the first year getting the department more efficient in its present activities within the existing structure.

"Don't get me wrong, I'm not saying that going on these committees isn't the right thing to do, but I'm saying that if you are going to complain about the amount of work that we have got on our plate at the moment. Then if he had the choice, the choice should be to come back to the department for a year and ensure that this place is working properly.....It's nice to have everything spot on. That's where I would have thought personally the first year would have been spent. Whereas he's obviously chosen to go another way."^6

Peter saw the changes as yet another example of society becoming more 'soft' and 'undisciplined' (a key element in the extreme position within the sporting perspective), and that it was the place of the physical education department to take "a hard line to stop the trend"^7, and felt that Alex had ignored his responsibilities in this area. In 1984 he noted;

"I've noticed this year that standards are dropping very fast in all sorts of ways, discipline, dress, and everything else. It's dropping very fast, and things like organisational details, like putting kit away. Discipline factors like that. The sports hall is filthy, and I think that what needs to be done in the
department at the moment is a concentrated effort by everyone
to improve all that. Not to go, off on these airy-fairy
theoretical things, which is what they tend to do at the moment.
I think everything at the moment is geared toward a theoretical
thing. I don't know what it's for, whether it's window dressing
for people to see." 71

"I would have thought coming into a new school he'd want to
spend a few years making sure that the department ran properly.
I would like to see a much more formal approach by everyone in
the P.E. department." 72

Ensuring that the department was organised efficiently in order to
prevent stressful situations arising was a key element in the
thinking of Peter and Simon, and continued to be throughout the
study, and formed a major influence in their resistance to the
innovations, indicating the perceived importance of controlling the
environment in and around the department in terms of stress
reduction.

(11.8) TEACHING IS ACHIEVING.

One of the emergent categories closely linked to control concerns
was that of 'teaching is achieving', in which the teachers felt that
an essential part of 'being' a teacher was the production of some
end product, that is, the teacher must teach something. This end
product was then used to define themselves as 'good' or 'bad' teacher
in particular lessons. Since the physical educators worked in
isolation from each other for most of the time73, rarely observing
each others lessons or discussing each others work, there was little
opportunity for them to develop a common technical culture. Due to
this they did not see themselves as sharing a viable, generalised
body of knowledge and practice. Hence, the teachers felt insecure in terms of their influence on children, they were not sure that they could make all the children learn, nor at times were they sure that they made any difference at all. As Monica notes;

"I hope they do enjoy moving around and feeling fitter. I also hope that they are learning. I think that they can learn a lot of 'rights' and 'wrongs' in P.E. as well, and a lot of self discipline. I think that we contribute ever such a lot to a child's character, more so probably than any other subject........How one measures that I just don't know."

Often pupil learning was seen as determined by factors outside of the teacher's control, such as, the peer group, family, and media etc. According to Lortie(1975), this lack of technical culture, an analytical orientation, and a serious sharing and reflection amongst teachers creates ambiguity and lack of direction. He points out that, "The teachers craft...is marked by an absence of concrete models for emulation, unclear lines of influence, multiple and controversial criteria, ambiguity about assessment timing, and instability in product."(p42). Such intangibility, complexity and remoteness of learning outcomes makes the teacher's assessment of his/her impact endemically uncertain. Since at Branstown School the department had no 'objective' criteria in the form of public examinations to measure their effectiveness by, visible outcomes in terms of skilled performance production by pupils became central to the physical educators judgements of their own achievement in lessons, particularly for those holding the sporting perspective.
This uncertainty of effect influenced the teachers at Branstown School to favour social situations in which definite pupil outcomes (products) were made evident. The essential link with control being the view that only within a 'structured' environment can these products be achieved. The teachers used certain criteria for judging the success of their own teaching as expressed within the constructs of 'good' or 'bad' lesson. Within any lesson it needs to be noted that a number of criteria are operating in any single lesson, with the teacher assessing a number of things at the same time. Continued observation and discussions with the physical educators indicated that they tended to assess on one or two dimensions, and form a general impression according to these criteria which are themselves situationally specific and context bound. The three main criteria to emerge at Branstown School were attainment, effort, and enjoyment. In considering what they wished to achieve in their lessons the following comments were typical.

"On whether or not the children are enjoying taking part in what they are doing. Whether they are actually learning something from you, and you see an end product no matter how small."  

"As long as you know what you are doing then you can teach a specific sport. Then you are able to teach them, so in one lesson if we teach them one element of the game, then that's fine, I've taught it, then there's the element of enjoyment of fun that comes with that." 

"Insist on the best. All I insist upon, on every kid that I teach is that he try, I mean really try."
The attainment category includes the pupils' acquisition of skill, knowledge and learning. Attainment level does not necessarily imply learning, yet both of these are criteria. Attainment is assessed, and related to previous attainment to denote learning or progression, but a lesson may be deemed 'good' if attainment is maintained rather than improved (particularly with low ability pupils). This obviously relates to teacher conceptions of pupil ability and performance, that is, what the teacher feels the children are capable of, and if they meet his/her level of expectation. The main environmental cues available for such an assessment is the production of physical skills as definable and visible end products, such as, the ability to complete a lay-up shot in basketball, since such outcomes confirm (to both teacher and pupil) that the teacher has had an effect as 'teacher' on the child.

Pupil effort was frequently mentioned in relation to involvement or commitment, even though as Peter realised it is difficult to assess, "It is difficult to know if a kid is trying hard. I suppose it's attitude and discipline in a lesson, and everything else. If he is trying it is obvious that he is working and not messing about'. The cues for effort were the manner in which the pupils went about their activities, their reactions and expressions, plus work rate and perseverance on task (not giving up). Effort was a universal criteria for all the physical educators and was applied to pupils of all abilities, since it was felt that no more could be asked than 'maximum effort'. If effort was evident then any lack of progression and learning was excusable since the causal factors
were then defined as beyond the teachers ability to control for which they could not be responsible, as Simon noted of one class, 'This lot just haven't got it, I'm pleased that they just work hard and enjoy it.'\textsuperscript{\textdegree}\textsuperscript{o}. This was predominantly the view held for those groups which were classified by the teacher as 'low ability' since the possibility of attainment with such groups seemed remote, they were expected to comply to conceptions of 'busy, happy and good'.\textsuperscript{\textdegree} Effort remained an important criteria because the teachers felt they were able to influence this by various motivational strategies, and therefore assess their impact as 'teacher' on the children.

The third criteria of 'enjoyment' was particularly vague and ambiguous. It was not something the teachers 'taught for', but was a subsidiary or by-product of other criteria. Often with low ability groups it was the major criteria for teacher success in relation to a containment strategy. Commenting on one low ability group Simon notes;

"Looking at the lower band kids we had yesterday over in the gym, and 45L. They leave (school) with very little, to the point at which we are saying we contain rather than teach, they may get some enjoyment out of it but that's about all." \textsuperscript{\textdegree}^{2}

As mentioned the criteria used to assess teacher success was context dependent, but specifically related to the central conception that 'teaching is achieving', hence identity as 'teacher' can remain intact as long as at least one of the criteria is met in a lesson. This means that with some groups the teacher feels more 'teacher' than with other groups, such as, with groups that are high in
attainment, effort and enjoyment, and which are categorized as 'good' lessons. This had important implications for teacher perceptions of the changes at Branstown School, since these structural changes undermined the possibility of achieving desired end products for several of the teachers with particular groups of children.

(11.10) MIXED ABILITY GROUPS AS REDUCING ACHIEVEMENT POTENTIAL IN GAMES AND GYMNASTICS

It was recognised that a great deal of 'work' was covered with the top-group in games lessons as opposed to a mixed-ability group, and the former were predominantly classified as 'good' lessons. The following comments are typical of the concerns within the sporting perspective over the demise of the top-group situation in games with the proposed change to mixed ability tutor groupings for these lessons.

"I have a top-group in hockey for 1st years, that's quite nice, it gives you a chance to work with your team players....Also you can move much faster, where the bottom groups are still dribbling or hitting, with the top group you are working out a system of taking corners, something very complicated.....So I think it would slow down the progress that you made."  

"As far as the major games are concerned it's very difficult if you have just got thirty boys together, complete mixed-ability, to actually do anything on the games side, to make any real progress in terms of the skills and the tactics, because you have such a wide ability range in there.....I think that in games you have to stream or group them or whatever."  

"It's been quite nice, I've had a couple of top-groups, and the amount of work I have covered with them has been tremendous. Put them in a mixed-ability session and I don't think I'd have got so far."  

"If you have a top-group, and you've got a top-group that wants to work, then it comes, it's relatively easy, because you get to
teach what you want to teach, what you want to do, that's what you are there for. Whereas, if you teach a mixed-ability groups you have got to do some social and control work, which isn't supposed to happen. If I was teaching a top-group I'd get far more done than if I was teaching a tutor group definitely.

The top-group situation was favoured since it provided pupils who could attain and display physical skills plus tactical knowledge, put in effort, enjoy themselves, and not present control problems. To teach these was very rewarding to the teacher since it confirmed, with relatively low investment of energy, their conception of themselves as 'good teacher'. Rachel claimed that when in contact with the top-group she felt as though she was "really teaching", as opposed to merely "amusing" the low ability bands which "anyone could do". An additional pressure for Rachel was her desire to complete the skills syllabus which was posted up in the female changing rooms for each group, her main fear being that a member of the department would have one of her classes next year and find that they were deficient in practical skills. Simon confirms that the low ability groups are much more tiring to teach with little visible return at the end of the lesson in comparison to top-group situations. Considering a special class gymnastics lesson he had just taken in which one of the pupils joined in wearing full school uniform he notes:

"John Allen running around in his blazer and trousers is a classic. If you asked John Allen, 'John, can you show me any ways of getting across the mat?'. He'd stand there, he just wouldn't have a clue. He'd fall over or something and wouldn't know what you were trying to get at. In fact if you asked him to get from one side to another, he'd probably just walk, 'Good suggestion John, think of another', and he just wouldn't come up with anything."
Here Simon indicates the high degree of involvement required of the teacher with such pupils for little return in terms of physical skills improvement, and several times during the lesson he looked across to the researcher and shrugged his shoulders in exasperation at the efforts of pupils in this class. Jeremy when considering one of his own mixed-ability gymnastics classes claimed it to be more tiring than games lessons, and that at times he felt out of his depth, that is, a 'non-teacher', with the major problem being that for all his efforts he often left the lesson feeling that he had achieved nothing at all. This influenced the teachers (except Alex and Monica) to view working with mixed-ability and low ability pupils as 'debit' situations characterised by high teacher investment for low pupil returns of skill attainment and visible progress. In contrast top-group situations and able pupils were seen as high 'credit' encounters with high returns for minimum investment by the teacher in which visible (to pupils, other physical educators, and the rest of the staff) product outcomes predominated.

(11.11) THE PRIMACY OF VISIBLE ACCOUNTABLE SKILL PRODUCTION.

Credit situations involve the production of physical skills which are directly observable to the teacher, pupils, and other members of staff either on watching the lesson or at a later date, for example, in playing for a school team. The need for visibility had a strong influence upon those holding the sporting perspective in their orientation to the activity of educational gymnastics, and the games-for-understanding approach to teaching that Alex began to
advocate in 1983 and which he saw as central to his idealist perspective in relation to the proposals for change. In terms of the evaluation of lessons such aspects as cooperation, leadership, and social competence were rarely considered (except for Alex). This is in keeping with the evidence in the literature concerning the aims and objectives of physical educators, where social competence is consistently ranked low. These aspects are easy to generalise about, such as, team games are about cooperation, but difficult to discuss more specifically and plan for with regard to individual lessons, and are not frequently utilised in lesson evaluation. When mentioned by the physical educators holding the sporting perspective they were seen as by-products of skill acquisition, the learning context of the activities, and the teaching-learning situation, hence they were seen to be taught directly, whereas attainment and effort were tangible accountable products indicating teacher as 'being' teacher and having an affect. Simon makes it clear why tangible products were preferred.

"People aren't interested in the little extra bits that subjects can offer (social education), they are interested in that little piece of paper at the end of the day. A bit of an analogy is, as a tutor you can say, 'Well, I get on well with my kids', and somebody can say 'Big deal!', and you say, 'I really get on well with my kids, they are great kids, and I know this much about them......They say, 'Well what does that prove? What did they get from it? What does it mean?'. And you say, 'It doesn't mean bugger all, it just means I get on very well with my kids, and I have got a good relationship with them'. But people want, it's like a currency, they want something at the end of the day to say 'this is what I got out of that'."

This conception of currency holds for both teacher and pupil, and reduces the value of social competence as a criteria for evaluation,
since such progress is based on cues that are not only vague and ambiguous but long term in their orientation, which is not suitable for the immediacy of the classroom where immediate demonstrable signs of progress are required for teacher identity to remain intact. Hence, educational gymnastics for Peter and Simon was perceived as an activity that was vague and ambiguous in terms of outcome, and so this activity was transformed into formal gymnastics where they could see an end product.

"I tend to run a more formal type of thing. With the 2nd years this morning we did neckspring over the box, and longstrides and so forth....I think that they tend to enjoy it rather more. There was certainly a lot of lads this morning who at the start of the lesson didn't want to know, 'I can't do that, I'm not doing that'. Everyone did it during the lesson, everyone got over." 92

"I always end up with coming back to formal because I think at the end of the day the kids prefer it. You could say, 'O.K.-today I learnt to run into space,' when you are asked 'What did you learn today?'. Although you go through that as a matter of course anyway. I think the kids would like to be able to say, 'I did a headspring, neckspring, or hanstand'. Something concrete they can say they have done. That's to me a level of achievement." 93

Simon admits to specifically not liking educational gymnastics because there is no tangible end product for him to guage his effectiveness by24, and Peter echoes these worries, claiming that in formal gymnastics some "actual teaching is done"25. It was also felt by both these teachers and Rachel that social education could just as easily take place in games as in educational gymnastics, so there was no problem in making these lessons skill orientated with no time for 'pupil discovery'. Having transformed educational gymnastics into formal gymnastics, then, once again high ability
pupils were seen as high credit individuals and the less able are judged on the criteria of effort and enjoyment.

In direct contrast were Alex's views contained within the idealist perspective, in which low ability pupils were perceived to be high credit individuals, since the more able would achieve anyway with little help from the teacher, that is, for him working with high ability groups made him less of a 'teacher' than when he worked with low ability pupils, he notes:

"I experience more satisfaction, there is more success, and I feel a lot better when I have come out of a gymnastics lesson, when I have seen a few kids faces when they have done something for the first time and they are not the good ones. Now that means more to me than seeing the team win a football or rugby match. Perhaps because I came through a different system as soon as I left college." 96

Here Alex displays a different 'exchange rate' from his colleagues, with small gains in attainment with low ability pupils being worth a major investment by the teacher. This, however, remains an achievement orientation, since Alex was concerned to produce a desired 'end product', which for him was a socially competent individual with a positive attitude towards physical activity on leaving school. To achieve these desired outcomes in lessons the structured environment provided by formal and educational gymnastics, was seen as superior to the team games situation, because in the latter the teacher could not control and direct the pupil specifically to certain experiences which he/she desired them to have97. Large games lessons were seen to 'dilute' the available experiences for children, and small grid games were preferred by
Alex in order to intensify skill practice and isolate desired experiences like leadership and co-operation. The top-group system was seen as symptomatic of an elitist system, which did not meet the needs of children and turned a great many off physical activity, and this was a direct denial of Alex's achievement aspirations which could only be met by structural changes in the curriculum, which in turn undermined the achievement aspirations of several of the teachers within his department as has been indicated.

(11.12) SUMMARY.

The two core categories of 'teaching is controlling', and 'teaching is achieving' which emerged during the Branstown Study were seen to be inextricably linked, since controlling the environment (which included the pupils) was seen by the physical educators as essential in allowing them and the pupils to achieve, which was seen as central to teaching, which was itself central to 'being' a teacher. Control of pupils and 'discipline' in general formed a critical aspect of the sporting perspective, however, for both perspectives control was essential to 'being' a teacher since it created routines which reduced the potential stress of the teaching day. The Hidden Pedagogy in operation demanded that the teachers made a large investment of energy and time in initial contacts with pupils in order to impose their definition of the situation over that of the pupils, and then to routinise the forms of interaction that were acceptable to the teacher from then on in the relationship. Later interactions with pupils become more personalised and context
specific as the teachers' informal rules predominated, but the essential tension of 'losing control' was always present.

Having made substantial investments of self initially in routinising their control procedures with pupils, several of the department were concerned over the proposed structural changes in the curriculum since they were seen to undermine and detract from their initial investment in this aspect of school life, which in the new circumstances would require another substantial investment as different control routines were constructed. This new phase of investment was seen to have little in the form of immediate or long term rewards in relation to the desired end products of visible pupil achievement. This achievement by pupils of visible product outcomes in the form of physical skills, was central to the teachers ability to define themselves as 'good' or 'bad' teacher, giving a 'good' or 'bad' lesson, and these in turn were seen to depend upon the teachers ability to control the environment. Within this linkage, from the sporting perspective, high ability pupils were seen as 'credit' units in interaction since they did not create control problems, and gave large returns in the form of the visible products of achievement, with minimal investment from the teacher. In contrast, low ability pupils were seen as 'debit' units in interaction, since they required a high investment of time and energy from the teacher for little return in the form of visible skills production. In addition low ability pupils were seen as posing a threat to teacher control, and with their low skill levels were judged in terms of effort and enjoyment in relation to
achievement. For several holding the sporting perspective, working with mixed ability groups and the less able led to them feeling less of a 'teacher', and they only gained the feeling of being a 'real' teacher with high ability groups and pupils.

In contrast, from within the idealist perspective where the emphasis was more on the social education of the pupil, Alex saw the low ability groups and pupils as high credit situations, and working with the very able as a 'debit' situation where he felt less of a 'teacher'. His proposals for curriculum change would promote credit situations from his own perspective, but deny the incidence of credit situations for those within the sporting perspective since it would mean that the top-group situation in games lessons was removed and these lessons would become mixed ability, that is, create a large debit situation from within the sporting perspective. Not surprisingly this resulted in tensions and conflicts arising within the department which were resolved by micropolitical solutions as discussed in Chapters 14, 15, and 16.

(11.13) NOTES AND AUDIT TRAIL FOR CHAPTER ELEVEN.

3. S-85-7-3
4. A-83-2-19
5. K-83-3-13
6. See Micropolitics 1, Chapter 14.
7. A-86-14-14
8. See Kozol(1968)
10. This parallels the 'hidden curriculum' discussed by Jackson(1968) and Snyder(1971) which children must come to terms with if they are to operate successfully in the classroom.
11. In recent years the idea of analysing classroom activities in terms of their strategic qualities is one that has grown in popularity amongst ethnographers, such as, Delamont (1983), Hammersley (1980, 1983), A. Hargreaves (1979), Pollard (1982), and Woods (1980a, 1980b). In particular Hammersley (1976) identifies 3 basic strategies, (a) presenting authoritative appearances and assuming the normality of the arrangement wherein they decide the rules, (b) demonstrating their superiority, for example, how they run their lesson and command the only acceptable definition of the situation, and (c) 'easing the pains of childhood', for example, by discreet relaxation of certain rules at certain times. Woods (1979) identifies the following strategies, socialization, domination, negotiation, fraternization, absence or removal, ritual and routine, occupational therapy, and morale boosting. Denscombe (1985) includes many of the previous strategies in his conceptualisation of domination, classroom management, and cooptation.


13. Huberman (1980) describes the following characteristics of classroom life. (a) multidimensionality - the classroom as a crowded place with several actions and functions to be carried out, such as, discipline, supplying equipment, giving instructions, forming and maintaining relationships, (b) simultaneity - interacting with one pupil and monitoring the behaviour and reactions of others, preparing the next practice or question, directing simultaneous groups, (c) unpredictability - anything can happen, what works well with one pupil is ineffective for another, different classes react differently to the same teachers over time.

14. Simon, field notes February 1984

15. Lowenstien (1975) distinguishes between 'violence' which he defines as fairly vicious attacks on other pupils or members of staff, and 'disruptive behaviour' which includes any behaviour
short of physical attack which interferes with the teaching process and/or upsets the normal running of the school or lesson.
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95. P-86-5-5
96. A-83-1-11
97. A-83-2-2
98. A-84-4-11
The taken for granted 'right' of teacher autonomy in the classroom by the physical educators had a significant influence upon their ability to deflect or ignore the implications for their practice of the proposed changes that Alex was attempting to introduce. This concern for autonomy is not specific to physical educators but teachers in general, and David Hargreaves (1980) notes:

"The most startling feature of teachers in their relationships with adults, including colleagues, is their sensitivity to observation whilst teaching. Like sexual activity, teaching is seen as an intimate act which is most effectively and properly conducted when shrouded in privacy. To be watched is to inhibit performance. Most teachers simply prefer to work alone with a class of pupils." (Hargreaves, D., 1980, p141)

At Branstown School teacher autonomy was held to be sacrosanct, the unwritten rule being 'live and let live', and, 'don't interfere with other teachers lessons'. This illustrates the powerful cult of individualism that is associated with the occupational culture of teaching', which prevails even when pupils may be considered in physical danger. During the summer of 1985 Simon saw Rachel teaching a discus lesson which he felt was badly organised and ignored certain safety factors, such as, isolating 'left-handers' at one end of the throwing line. Despite the risk to pupil safety he did not intervene immediately in the lesson, nor did he communicate his concerns to Rachel directly, but notes, "The thing was, it wasn't my place to tell her, so, I would pass it onto Alex and say, 'Look Alex, somebody is going to get hurt and it's got to come from you"'2.
Alex did discuss the matter with Rachel, but outside the classroom context, he did not intervene directly in her lesson, nor did he demand that Rachel change her style of teaching. 'Suggestions' were made as to how to improve the safety of her lessons in athletics. Significantly, Rachel at this time had passed her probationary year, and Alex admitted that the situation was more 'complicated' than it would have been a year ago (when she was a probationer), since as Head of Department he could 'officially' intervene in any lesson, and whilst it was accepted that this may occur with probationers, it was not 'acceptable' with qualified teachers where such interventions would create conflict and tension, from both the individual teacher and the rest of the department. In a sense, in terms of the innovations at Branstown School the classroom was a 'no-go area' where the teacher was free to teach how he/she pleased, and to introduce changes if and when he/she pleased, changes in this arena could not be imposed. This example lends support to Warren's (1973) view that in the classroom, teacher behaviour is relatively immune to control processes generated either within or outside the informal structure and organisation of the school, and they may go their own ways with relative impunity. This was a major problem for Alex in his attempts to change the practice of his staff, and reflecting in 1986 over the previous three years he notes:

"There's a lot of things that you can change, but at the end of the day you can't change a persons personality. And if a persons personality is going to effect their teaching, then you cannot change their teaching to that degree. You can change what they are teaching, and you can try and change their perceptions of what their aims should be, but individual teachers in the classroom you cannot touch, you cannot make them change how they teach if they do not want to. You could go in and demand
things, but it would only have an adverse effect and you would lose in the end."

Simon confirms Alex's diagnosis with his following comment.

"Nobody can come into your classroom and tell you how to teach, unless it's so extreme that you might kill a child, but even then they would find it hard to make you change. Teaching doesn't work like that, well not in my experience anyway. I'm quite happy to have someone watch, but not start telling me what and how to teach it."

In 1986 both Simon and Peter claimed that their classroom practice had not changed at all, despite changes in other areas relating to the process of change, such as the development of a strategic rhetoric, which itself is based on teacher autonomy in the classroom, hence what is said outside of the classroom situation need bear little relationship to what goes on inside for the following reasons as indicated by Simon;

"...because no bugger hardly ever sees what you do in the classroom. I mean the Headmaster has never come into one of my gymnastics lessons, he'd have to walk too bloody far. He might see me teaching rugby from far off for a while, but I shouldn't think that he stands there analysing if I'm doing 'games-for-understanding' or whatever." 

When teachers are placed under scrutiny in their classrooms they become anxious over the 'outsider' making judgements and criticisms. One of the early tasks of the researcher in the Branstown Study involved alleviating fears that the purpose of his observation sessions was to evaluate their performance as teachers. It was explained that "I'm just interested in what you are doing. You are much more experienced than myself and I have no intention of making judgements as to how you do things". Despite this during the first
months of observing the researcher was often asked at the end of a lesson, "Was that O.K.- was that alright?", at which the point was made again that he was not there to judge their teaching, and this was confirmed by showing them the observation notes which merely indicated what had happened in the lesson and what the teacher said and did, with no grading or evaluations of content. This fear of judgement extended to each other, and although several teachers were happy to be observed in an activity where they felt 'expert' and competent, they were less happy about being observed in their 'weaker' activities. For instance, Simon had no worries about Jeremy or Rachel watching his basketball or rugby lessons where he felt 'expert', plus they were not 'experienced' teachers and were not in a position to judge his lessons. He was less open to having Alex come in and watch his educational gymnastics lesson since Alex was classed as an expert in this area and Simon admitted this was his 'weak' activity in which he did not want to be observed and judged.

Teacher autonomy in this sense is a protection from criticism and judgement by outsiders. The situated uniqueness and inherent uncertainty of classroom life was discussed in the previous chapter, and besides limiting the applicability of formal (bureaucratic) rules these also influence the extent to which it is possible to make the activities of the teacher within the classroom accountable to outsiders and colleagues. Since teachers strive to develop, and invest in, a specialised and particularised knowledge of their pupils in order that their decisions and assessments become contextualised, it makes it extremely difficult for them to be
accountable to outsiders who do not have access to the same specific particularised knowledge. Eggleston (1979) makes this explicit when he comments that:

"No authority outside the individual classroom can possibly make many of the decisions now required of the teacher because no external authority can have access to the evidence on which they are based." (Eggleston, 1979, p.2)

In a real sense then the teacher is a 'law unto him/herself', which breeds both security and insecurity, since not only does it prevent teachers from criticizing each other, but it also makes it more difficult for them to praise each others efforts as well, thereby reinforcing the competence anxieties it is designed to protect, and can lead to feelings of isolation.

(12.2) WORKING IN TIME AND SPACE FRAMES – EXTENDING THE CLOSED CLASSROOM

As indicated teacher autonomy was a taken for granted 'right' at Branstown School, and as Bidwell (1965) and Lortie (1969) suggest the immediate work situation in schools serves to continually redefine the conception of autonomy, with the former noting the temporal and functional differentiation which characterises the job. At Branstown School with the five period day the teachers were split into separate teaching areas and segregated during lesson times, whilst work was organised into concurrent lessons where each teacher was responsible for separate portions of subject matter based on a loosely defined syllabus, building a sense of autonomy into the
everyday practice of the teachers. Hence, the teachers were rarely in a position to observe, yet alone supervise or control the activities of colleagues. When asked about how the men taught, Catherine after three years in the school, could not formulate an answer, "I don't know, you've got me there, I don't know (laughs). I haven't seen enough of the men teach I suppose". Rachel in her probationary year was also aware of the lack of opportunities to watch others teach;

"I don't really see much of the other P.E. staff, because it's a big school and we tend to get spread out in different areas. We only meet in between lessons, and then I will get my group out and she (Monica) will get hers. I see more of the Head to actually talk to in meetings.......Break is very short, by the time you have thrown the kids out and you have about ten minutes left, and then you have to go down because they are coming in about two minutes early. Time to have a quick cup of coffee and then that's it." 

When observation did take place it was evident that the focus was on practical issues. Catherine in her probationary year watched Boris Green and picked up points on control and organization, such as, making pupils get their feet out of the water in swimming lessons before the teacher speaks. Jeremy also indicates that during his probationary year his attention was on the practical aspects of teaching, such as, he noticed that Peter used a long 'Stoooooop!' to close an activity down in the sports hall, which Jeremy found to be more effective (due to the acoustics of the hall) than the way he had been told to do this at college, which was to use a short sharp command, 'and stop!'. This is a two way process and those offering suggestions of improvement for novice teachers also focused on practical advice. Rachel in discussing the content
of her meetings with Alex after he had watched her lessons in her probationary year notes;

"Ideas for practices that I might not have thought of. Like in the basketball, you can use the white line rather than use that one (blue line), might be a better idea. He makes points about things you hadn't thought about. Obviously he's got more experience than me, so it's not like teaching practice where I see them more as a threat." 14

Practical advice to probationers was acceptable, but became problematic if offered to 'experienced' teachers, where once again the code of the closed classroom dominated. This was so even in the games lessons that were held outside on the fields, where the teaching of others was openly visible to colleagues. One might assume that this provided an 'open' classroom context, however, the teachers were involved in the construction of a closed environment. The boundaries of the pitch defined an enclosed space within which the teacher worked and negotiated his/her personalised rules. When pupils in the half-year games groups sometimes wandered into the wrong group the individual teaching space was strongly redefined by comments such as, 'Smith, what are you doing in my lesson, you should be with Mr.Griggs, that's his lesson over there' 15.

The essential point is that the pitch (an open environment) was recreated as a closed classroom and on individual pitches each teacher expected not to be interfered with. The problems of coping with thirty plus children in an open area, often in bad weather conditions, also reduced the opportunity to make prolonged observations of other teachers lessons, even when they were on the
next pitch. Vague impressions rather than exact details were remembered by the physical educators, such as, 'Simon was doing scrummaging with his group wasn't he?, 'Alex looked like his lesson was on passing', and this vagueness assists in preventing evaluations being made of teacher performance. Even when the observation is detailed enough for the individual to pass judgement, individual intervention was not an acceptable course of action.

This was made evident when Simon who was teaching rugby on a pitch adjacent to Jeremy noticed that the latter was teaching the incorrect binding for scrummaging, and as the researcher was assisting in Simon's lesson he drew my attention to it. Simon did not, however, leave his group with me and go across to Jeremy and mention the fault, nor did he ask me to go over and talk to Jeremy. As we walked off the field at the end of the period he wasn't sure that he would mention it to Jeremy at all, since it might offend him. In this sense the closed classroom extends not only into 'open' classroom settings but also to other social contexts within the school, and teacher criticism and judgement of colleague was frowned upon per se.

That teacher autonomy to teach as desired, coupled with a freedom from judgement and criticism extends to other settings was illustrated by Jeremy's reluctance to discuss with his colleagues the new ideas for teaching that he learnt on a Blackpool Easter School course in 1984, since he felt they would be taken as an intrusion.
"I told myself not to come back and 'explode' and say 'why don't we do this? and this is great', and go on and come out with all these arguments. What I thought I would do is to keep it really quiet, but if people asked me about the course then I'd tell them. ....I had a quiet word with Alex, and he'd like me to do a couple of things that I learnt up there, different types of teaching." 17

Jeremy then utilised the closed classroom to experiment with the different teaching styles he had been exposed to at Blackpool, but even when he found these to be very successful he still did not communicate this to his colleagues for fear that it would be interpreted as a criticism of their teaching. The autonomy ethic in effect allowed Jeremy to experiment in his classroom but also effectively prevented him from discussing problems and sharing successes with colleagues, which he was able to do on the Blackpool course. Beyond the confines of the school as a work place such questioning was possible and acceptable, he notes;

"You chat, and you recognise problems that you have yourself....I felt great after that course. I came back and I was bloody bubbling. I feel more confident to teach now that I have experimented....Not change my whole curriculum and say 'we are going to do this all week now'. I just did it on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I just experimented, I learnt from the mistakes I made." 18

Autonomy in this sense can mean isolation as the self-containment of teachers extends itself beyond the classroom situation. As Lortie(1964) notes;

"The self-contained classroom......is more than a physical reality, for it refers as well to a social system, a set of recurrent and more or less permanent social relationships. Under this arrangement the teacher is separated from immediate supervision, and intrusion into his private domain is prevented by a set of understandings subscribed to by administrative colleagues and teacher colleagues. A set of norms exist to buttress the ecological separation:
(1) the teacher should be freed from interference of other adults while teaching, 
(2) teachers should be considered and treated as equals, and 
(3) teachers should act in a non-intervening but friendly manner towards one another." (Lortie, 1964, pp. 274-275)

Within such an atmosphere at Branstown School, with the contained norms of non-intervention, open discussions and questioning of others teaching, both in terms of pedagogy and paradigm, were noticeably absent and when engaged in were taken to be threatening to the teacher under scrutiny. In such situations the closed classroom provides a defence which when related to the structural looseness of the school as a work place allows teacher interpretation to arise as critical.

(12.3) STRUCTURAL LOOSENESS AND TEACHER INTERPRETATION.

Bidwell (1965) claims that schools are characterised by what he calls 'structural looseness' in their organization, and that it is specifically this looseness that allows members of the organization a reasonable degree of freedom from the constraints imposed by the formal structure, rules and procedures. At the epicentre of this structural looseness is the 'closed classroom' which means that although rules and regulations exist at a general level, their application in the classroom is very much left to the discretion of the individual teacher according to the specific circumstances as perceived by that particular teacher.
The department at Branstown School recognised that although a curriculum and syllabus existed for each activity, this acted as a general guide and did not prescribe how the teacher should teach it. In accordance with this view Peter felt that the curriculum in 1983 as it was laid down was not "strong" in the sense that the progression of skills and the manner of teaching were outlined in detail, so that at any point in the year each teacher would know exactly what the others in the department were doing with their classes. He notes:

"It's a fairly flexible sort of thing, there are a few guidelines laid down, but whether you stick to them or not I don't know......If you look at the schemes of work that's in there (filing cabinet), it says '3rd year basketball, badminton, hockey', or whatever, and whoever is taking them almost does what they want to I think with them." 20

The structural looseness was highlighted by the men's interpretation of 'educational gymnastics' on the curriculum, as Peter points out:

"It says 'ed gym', well, what does that mean to you? You can do hundreds of things under that topic. And if it says 'gymnastics', what is it you want them to do in there? Each teacher will do it differently." 21

"Well, ed gym is on the timetable at the moment you see. I suppose you say 'what is ed gym'? You can't put down a syllabus in ed gym as you can in maths, where you can say that you have got to be able to do quadratic equations by the end of the term. If you put down in ed gym that they've got to be able to make 'good landings', or 'run properly', or make 'good shapes' in the air......You can say you are doing that by doing formal things in the end really.....I don't think that you can actually say that 'you are going to teach ed gym, and it will be taught in this way'. I think that the teacher has got to put it over in the way that he thinks is the best way to put it over." 22

Similarly, Simon in relation to the introduction of the tutor-group system notes, "Well, the lesson is timetabled, but what you do in it
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will be up to you. Hence, Simon and Peter in 1985 when they were both teaching at the same time, manipulated the composition of the tutor-groups on arrival (where possible) to ensure that most of the 'best' ones were with one teacher, and the less able went with the other, that is, they imposed a semi-top-group structure onto the new system (this was done without Alex's knowledge). Indeed in September 1986 they were of the opinion that they had succeeded in gaining Alex's approval to invoke a top-group system once again in games lessons when pupils arrived of the same age range (Alex firmly denies this 'agreement' on his part and points out that Simon and Peter are misguided to assume this). Therefore even before the new system was introduced in September 1984, it was being anticipated that the new curriculum would itself contain a sufficient degree of structural looseness to enable teacher autonomy to prevail and within which the teacher could impose his/her own framework in which to teach. Alex clearly recognised this fact and was aware that no curriculum design would ever be able to prescribe how teachers taught. In 1986 he notes;

"You see the difference between me and Len Almond and a lot of other lecturers who are proposing changes, is that I don't end up with what Len Almond wants. I don't even end up with what I want, but I end up with a department, and teachers who are a lot closer to my philosophy than I would have been had I tried to steamroller things through." 26

Such compromises move Alex away from his 'ideal' curriculum and department, and are based on the sacrosanct nature of teacher autonomy which includes the interpretation of the teacher on how to teach an activity as central, which meant that Alex could not force
those within his department to change their classroom practice. He could, however, create changes in the content of the curriculum which for him necessitated alternative micropolitical strategies to be adopted in relation to the proposed changes.

(12.4) COMPETENCE CONCERNS.

Within the closed classroom the physical educators at Branstown School were removed from the evaluative glare of the outsider, and within the confines of their own lessons were free to succeed or fail according to their own achievement criteria. One of the key categories to emerge in relation to autonomy was that of competence, which itself contained the two sub-categories of 'technical competence' and 'procedural competence', both of which had an influence on the teachers' reactions to the proposals for change.

(12.5) TECHNICAL COMPETENCE

Technical competence is based on the individual's ability to execute a physical skill, and was central to the perceptions of 'being' a physical educator at Branstown School. It was accepted that to gain entrance to a course in physical education the individual had to have a basic competence in a wide range of skills. Simon notes that at college "You had to be competent in most things rather than brilliant at any one thing"\textsuperscript{27}, and Jeremy did not apply to Loughborough to study Physical Education because he didn't consider
himself "good enough" as he felt this institution did not accept all-rounders but only high level specialists in one sport.

All the department, with the exception of Monica, were actively involved in sport in 1983 and defined their expertise for teaching within these activities, that is, Simon was the rugby 'specialist', Peter was basketball and cricket, Jeremy was football, Catherine was netball, and Rachel was hockey. Alex was seen as the gymnastics specialist despite not being actively involved in it outside of school where his main interest from 1983 to 1986 was marathon running, he was however the most able performer of this activity in the department. Within these activities the teachers felt both technically and procedurally competent, however, depending on the individuals background at college/university certain activities were classified as personal weaknesses, which centred on the teachers ability to demonstrate a physical skill to the pupils in the class. Peter claimed that he taught games better than he taught gymnastics, one of the major reasons given for this difference was that he was a capable performer in games, and could give good demonstrations enabling him to feel more confident as 'teacher'. In gymnastics Peter felt less confident in lessons due to his inability to provide technical demonstrations, he notes;

"I think it's probably because I feel more comfortable. I can't demonstrate much in gymnastics, because I'm not much of a gymnast. I can demonstrate the fairly easy things, but there is no way that I can demonstrate anything that is difficult, because I couldn't probably fucking do it (laughs), I'll probably land on my head." 29

"I don't like it very much (educational gymnastics), because I don't think that I put it over that well...I'm not the greatest
teacher of gymnastics and I'll admit that, but I've found that most kids in a class can do a neckspring over a box off a trampette, not brilliantly but they can get over, and land on their feet with support.....I don't really know, I'm certainly not a good teacher in that way possibly because I don't really believe in it that much."

Peter's choice not to 'believe' in educational gymnastics was made very early on in his teaching career, and despite this activity having the greatest time allocation on his teacher training course it was generally treated as a 'laugh', that is, a non-serious activity by those involved, and no serious attempt was made by him or his student peers to improve their physical skills and knowledge in this activity. Simon and Jeremy confirm that at their different institutions the same attitude prevailed and that both left college knowing little in terms of educational gymnastics and how to demonstrate or organise in it. For Peter in particular his lack of technical competence in this activity was influential in his decision not to teach it at all in his lessons, but opt for the formal Olympic Gymnastics.

Simon claimed that demonstrations were an essential and integral part of the teaching process, since it made the activity easier to teach, the pupils expected it from a physical education teacher, and teacher demonstrations made a positive impact on teacher-pupil relationships. For him the ability to demonstrate was a central aspect of self in action, not to demonstrate was not to 'teach' and such feelings of anxiety were highlighted by physical injuries.

"This time last year I put my shoulder out, and so I had two months, well almost until Christmas of not being able to do anything. You feel, I suppose it's a type of insecurity, I think..."
it is, but you feel as though you have to justify why you are in there teaching the subject, and if you don't do it - then you don't teach it. You can teach it, but you don't teach it in the manner in which I think it should be taught.....The kids have got to get on and do whatever you are trying to teach them, and somewhere along the line they want to see it being done......Some people would say that there is no need (to demonstrate) because you will have built up your techniques of showing them without giving an example.....Now, whereas as an older person you can cope with the fact, that you are not going to give it as an example, then that's a different thing. Maybe I will feel that way." 32

In December 1985 Simon again suffered a serious injury (to his knee) whilst playing rugby on a Saturday, which prevented him from playing again until September 1986. During this period, movement in general was difficult and painful, with demonstrations in lessons being virtually impossible. In a telephone conversation during that period he claimed to be "deeply depressed" about the whole situation, since rugby was such an important part of his life, and he felt like a 'con-man' in school with the kids because he could not join in the games or demonstrate skills to them33. Even without injury Simon felt that he could not demonstrate in educational gymnastics and therefore transformed these lessons to a formalised style of gymnastics in which he could offer some basic demonstrations. Likewise, Jeremy found educational gymnastics difficult to demonstrate and teach even when he was at college;

"I knew then that I wasn't a gymnast, and I found it quite difficult to verbalise things, because you have to set tasks for them, which isn't difficult really in the things that I'm good at, but I'm not good at gymnastics.....It's certainly a weakness of mine....Football, rugby, I know everything about. Swimming I don't have to worry about, basketball I don't worry too much....That's the one though, ed gym, I have to work on." 34
In contrast to Peter and Simon, Jeremy was prepared to go on courses in order to remedy this weakness in his teaching. Significantly Jeremy saw it as influencing his 'value' in the job market in terms of occupational competence as he prepared to look for scale 2 posts beyond Branstown School, but both Simon and Peter saw their futures within the school, and because of the closed classroom did not see their inability to teach educational gymnastics as an impediment to their career prospects since it would not be made visible to other teachers in the school.

The women within the department held demonstrations to be important but not essential to their teaching, although once again specialist activities were favoured, as Catherine notes;

"Obviously you have got to have a certain competence, to a certain degree, otherwise you would be very limited wouldn't you....It doesn't mean that because I can't do it, that I can't teach it, but it helps......I play sport myself so I try and keep relatively fit. I try to do a lot of demonstrations in dance, and I do demonstrations in gym." 35

"Perhaps I feel more competent teaching netball because I'm doing it myself at the moment, so I feel up to date with it, and I've got a lot of things stored in my head. Whereas with other things I would have to sit down and think about it before I went in and did it." 36

Monica held a more extreme view, and with regards to claims that the teacher should be able to perform a skill before teaching it she notes;

"People who think that, it's just crap! I know because I am a crap performer....I was hopeless (at college). I'm good at some things, but you don't have to be a good performer to be able to teach it. It's other skills you have got to have. Observation skills, you have got to be able to observe and deduce from that observation what the problem is, and you have got to know which
words you need for that person to understand how to put it right."

This is a key point made by Monica since it shifts the emphasis onto the procedural competence of the teacher which needs to be utilised when the teacher is unable to demonstrate a particular skill.

(12.6) PROCEDURAL COMPETENCE AND THE TRANSLATION OF 'DISCURSIVE' TO 'PRACTICAL' CONSCIOUSNESS.

In relation to the 'practicality ethic' one of the criteria for judging the practicality of any proposal is that of 'procedural clarity', which is concerned with how clear the change is in terms of what the teacher will have to do. The question shifts from 'can I do it?', to 'how do I do it?' with regards to matching other concerns, such as, achievement and control criteria. Catherine makes this concern explicit in her comments on the 'games-for-understanding' approach that was central to the idealist perspective, and which she agreed with in principal but was unsure just how to put it into practice.

"It's going to take an awful lot of sitting down and just looking at before launching into it, because the majority of us have been traditionally trained and have set ways of doing things, and no matter how much you try you can't help but get into a set routine for teaching skills...It would be nice to see some people actually doing this work."

With regards to the games-for-understanding approach all the department expressed a wish to see it demonstrated in a practical
manner in order for them to pass judgement upon it, and possibly translate it into their own teaching. Catherine bemoaned the fact that there were few practical guidelines available for this 'new' approach, and that those that were available only catered for the 'one-off' lesson and not for a half-term or term block of work.

"...which is all great, but then be (Len Almond) doesn't tell you how to do it, and nobody seems to know (laughs), and this is what worries me about all this stuff. I mean O.K. teach games through understanding, O.K. draw me up a syllabus for it, because I don't know what's right and wrong.....nobody gives any set lessons to take an example from........it's good for a lesson but where do you go from there?. I can probably think of a lot of one-off lessons, but it's how to develop it over a half-term block, and what you achieve at the end of it." 40

The concern for procedural competence over the structured time span of a term or half-term block allocated within the curriculum was a common concern. Monica shared the same fears as Catherine in 1983, but in the Spring term of 1984 gained a place on a D.E.S. regional course at Cheltenham on the 'Changing Focus of Physical Education', which operated one day a week from February to June 1984, and focused on games-for-understanding and health related fitness. Initially Monica had been sensitised to new conceptual ideas at a one week course at Leeds during the half-term of the summer of 1983, yet did not know how to translate these ideas into practice. The Cheltenham course with its practical, experiential orientation provided the opportunity for this translation. As Monica notes;

"Every single day of the course (at Leeds) was a new idea, the games-for-understanding, health-related-fitness. All new words. I wasn't quite sure how to, put it all into practice. I wasn't quite sure how to teach it. I understood the principles, but I didn't understand how to translate it into the 'grass roots' level if you like." 41
"Cheltenham was a very practical course......we were taught as beginners, like kids on a course, so you learnt all the progressions, your initial lesson plans really. You needed that in the first place to get you started, and give you the confidence to try it out......I needed the Cheltenham course to show me how to put these ideas into practice." 42

"And that (Cheltenham course) helped me to get things straight in my mind, and apply the theory to the practical situation. It helped me ever such a lot, and I'm still trying out the new things that I wasn't able to start last term......I got most from Cheltenham, from the lectures involving practical work, whether it be with the staff who were on the courses or describing a practical situation." 43

Monica here indicates the dilemma of all the department (including Alex) on being exposed to new ideas, that is, the translation into practice, which involves a 'cognitive shift' from a 'practical' mode of consciousness to a 'discursive' mode44. The former refers to tacit stocks of knowledge which actors draw upon in the constitution of social activity45, whilst the latter involves knowledge which the actors are able to express at the levels of discourse. The Leeds course for Monica stimulated the 'discursive' mode of consciousness which in accordance with the 'practicality ethic' needed to be transformed into the 'practical' mode before this teacher would introduce any changes to her way of teaching in the classroom. The vital link in this transformation would appear to be the provision of 'practical exemplars' which provides a constructive model which is then 'testable' within the confines of the closed classroom in relation to the individuals personal frame of reference. This 'testing' phase is also crucial, during her course Monica did not discuss with her colleagues in the department the experimental procedures that she was using in some of her classes, "Because I didn't feel confident with it. I had to do it. I only felt conversent
with it after I actually tried it". In a reflective account in 1986
Monica elaborates her awareness of the need to accommodate the
practicality ethic of those in her department which necessitates the
translation of 'ideas' into 'practice'.

"When I first started I said, 'I want to try something and then
I'll get back to you. Let me see if I can get it to work'.
Because I didn't want to actually demonstrate it, and they felt
it had no use. So, I got it straight in my mind, and then I
started to talk about it to others. Not the men, I talked to the
women.....They went away and tried it themselves." 47

The women tried their versions of Monica's practice in their
classroom based upon her practical exemplars. In contrast Simon and
Peter made no attempt to transform the 'discursive' to the
'practical' mode of consciousness, and this was in part due to the
insulating effects of the closed classroom and its extension into
the social world of the department which prevented them coming into
contact with practical exemplars that may have assisted or
stimulated this transformation. As Simon with regards to the
stability of his own teaching style of 'formalised' educational
gymnastics in 1985 notes, "I mean nobody has provided me with any
other way, or a better way of teaching it, so I still mix it up with
formal".

(12.7) SUMMARY.

In relation to teacher concerns for autonomy and competence, the
picture to emerge at Branstown School concerning the innovative
ideas proposed by Alex, was one of teacher anxiety and isolation.
The proposed changes in the curriculum would mean that the men would have to teach an activity, educational gymnastics, in which they felt they lacked both technical and procedural competence. In terms of the concepts of 'games for understanding' and 'health related fitness' which Alex promoted as an integral aspect of his changes, all the department claimed to lack procedural competence, and this placed a great emphasis on teacher interpretation, which was itself protected by teacher autonomy and the closed classroom. Therefore, Alex was unable to directly control what went on in the classrooms of his department, where the physical educators were free to fail or succeed in experimenting with new practices and ideas, and unfortunately whilst failure could be hidden from view this situation also meant that success could not be shared in an open manner for fear of being classified as 'interfering'. For the physical educators there was a definite divide between the classroom context and the educational context, with the former being private and the latter a public arena for interaction with other teachers.

Paradoxically it seems that the psychological arrangements of teaching which originally were imposed to guarantee freedom to function and experiment with different teaching styles, appears at Branstown School to guarantee isolation and the freedom to fail and struggle with complex problems and new practices. Saranson (1971) quotes an unknown source as saying, "we may be becoming one world, but we seem to increasingly suffer from feeling each of us is one person alone" (p154). This loneliness located within the context of teacher isolation is not specific to Branstown School, rather it has
a long history as a normative characteristic of teaching°°, and Kane (1974) suggests that this form of isolation not only prevents any real reform, but also exhausts the teacher and dissipates effective planning. At Branstown School the organisational structure of the school day was not designed to encourage and support communication amongst the staff with a view to improving or changing their teaching in class, nor did it allow meaningful collaboration in confronting school-wide plus departmental problems, and this in particular made the translation of innovative ideas into practical realities highly problematic and anxiety ridden°°.

This same structure removed certain aspects of accountability from the teacher, but in doing so denied the possibilities of peer councelling, perhaps the major form of effective feedback available within the school, which would have enabled the physical educators to gain mastery of the complex skills of effective teaching, along with the critical transformation from the 'discursive' to the 'practical' mode of consciousness in relation to the innovations that Alex was proposing which would be critical for promoting any real change in classroom practice. Within the confines of the closed classroom the teachers respected each others right to autonomy, and the right to struggle to master or reject new forms of teaching and ideas without interference, whilst the major impetus (besides Alex) to encourage experimentation in the classroom came from the alternative non-threatening social settings of in-service courses which encouraged the open discussion of teacher concerns in the
classroom, which remained submerged and concealed for most of the time in Branstown School itself.

(12.8) NOTES AND AUDIT TRAIL FOR CHAPTER TWELVE.

1. For how the cult of individualism effects children see Jackson (1968) and Cagan (1978). For its effects on teachers see David Hargreaves (1982). For its wider manifestations and origins in Western society see Lukes (1973).
2. S-86-8-38
3. Hilsum and Start (1974) report that 48% of teachers rate 'opportunity to practice ones own ideas' as one of the major satisfactions of teaching (it is second only to holidays).
4. A-86-14-13
5. S-86-8-38
7. See Micropolitics 3, Chapter 16.
8. S-86-8-22
9. Field diary, October 1983
10. See also Dreeben (1970), Hanson and Harrington (1976), and McPherson (1972)
11. C-83-1-14
12. R-83-1-13
13. C-83-1-14
14. R-83-1-12
15. See Denscombe (1985) for additional examples of sorting 'my lot' from 'others' in open classroom settings.
16. Field notes, October 1983
17. J-84-5-2
18. J-84-5-16
19. See Ball and Lacey (1980)
20. P-83-1-6
21. P-83-1-7
22. P-83-2-9
23. S-83-3-3
24. S-86-9-1
25. A-86-15-1
26. A-86-14-6
27. S-83-1-2
29. P-83-1-3
30. P-83-2-5
31. S-83-1-16
32. S-83-1-16
33. Telephone conversation, February 24th 1985
34. J-83-1-20/21
35. C-83-4-1/5
36. C-83-2-4
37. K-84-4-5
38. See Doyle and Ponder (1977-78)
44. Giddens (1979) distinguishes between the 'practical' and 'discursive' modes of consciousness as part of his theory of structuration. Such distinctions are based on the philosophy of language, whereby it is possible to utter a complex sentence without being able to enumerate the linguistic rules instantiated in that sentence - in doing this a practical mode of consciousness is made evident. The further step of making the rules explicit requires a discursive consciousness of the formation of the sentence. Note this form of practical consciousness has similarities to Elbatz's (1983) multifaceted conception of teacher practical knowledge.

45. This 'practical' consciousness is similar to Schutz's (1961) 'recipe knowledge' in which "clear and distinct experiences are intermingled with vague conjectures; suppositions and prejudices cross well proven evidences; motives means and ends, as well as causes and effects are strung together without clear understanding of their real connections." (Esland, 1977, p17)

46. M-85-5-2
47. M-86-6-3
48. S-85-7-9

49. This supports the view of Knoblock and Goldstein (1971)

51. This supports the view of Goodland (1983)
CHAPTER THIRTEEN

STATUS
Teaching in general would appear to be an occupational group pervaded by a concern for status', and as Lortie(1975) realises;

"Teaching seems to have more than its fair share of status anomalies. It is honoured and disdained, praised as 'dedicated service' and lampooned as 'easy work'. It is permeated with the rhetoric of professionalism, yet features incomes below that earned by workers with considerably less education." (Lortie,1975,p10)

Hilsum and Start(1974) indicated that secondary teachers cite dissatisfaction with the status of the profession in society as their major complaint, yet the question as to whether teaching can claim to be a profession is constantly raised. In terms of status change Lortie(1969) claims it is a 'partial profession', Etzioni(1969) assigns it 'semi-professional' status, whilst the work of others suggests that it may be an occupational group in danger of 'deprofessionalization'. If, as Rothman(1984), utilising a process orientated perspective of professionalism suggests, professional status is only gained when groups "dominate their position in the labour force and maximise social and economic benefits"(p184), then the recent industrial dispute (1984-onwards), if anything was, and is, a battle for professional status. In terms of salaries, the Times Educational Supplement in July 1984, published a report claiming that teacher earnings had dropped in comparison with other non-manual workers from 137 percent of the average in 1974 (year of the Houghton Report) to 110 percent in 1983. They claim that the
average professional salary has increased by 270 percent compared with an increase of 198 percent for teachers, which is taken to indicate a marked deterioration in the financial and hence social standing of teachers in society.

The increased union activity in relation to the recent disputes lends support to the views of Lawn and Ozga (1981), that teachers in general may be more 'worker' than 'professional'. In addition, Lacey (1983) building on the work of Burns (1966) indicates that the very structural organisation of schooling, involving as it does a hierarchical career structure dominated by a 'mechanistic' style of management, may assist bureaucratization but impede claims to professionalism. Waller (1932) outlines other factors which also reduces such claims, including, a poor public image, a reluctant coerced clientele, depressed pay scales, along with the very nature of their work 'adults-in-a-childs-world'. Unfortunately as Hoyle (1980) realises, in education there has occurred the paradox of professionalization without status, whereby teachers have become more professional in terms of meeting the demands of clients, yet paradoxically the developments which have allowed this improvement in service are not likely to enhance their status. The present atmosphere amongst teachers appears to be one in which the majority consider themselves to be members of a profession, yet they are acutely aware that others in society may be less ready to acknowledge this status along with the rights and privileges which teachers believe such status should confer.
If teachers in general are prone to 'status panic', then physical educators may be under a phobic stress, as Hoyle (1986c) notes;

"As a profession, teaching is prone to status concerns and within teaching, physical educationists are particularly given to pondering status issues." (Hoyle, 1986c, p43)

McIntosh (1968) and Mangan (1986) have outlined the historic struggle of physical education to gain acceptance on the curriculum. When Lt. Commander Grenfell was appointed H.M.I. for Physical Training in 1909 he believed;

"That physical education should not be in the hands of ill-educated N.C.O.'s, but of educated and fully trained teachers, and he set about trying to give new dignity and prestige to his subject." (McIntosh, 1968, p158)

Such attempts would appear to have been in vain, since in 1969 Musgrove and Taylor indicated that different roles within the teaching profession were sharply distinguished and ascribed differences in prestige, with the physical education teacher being ranked the lowest, whilst Hoyle (1986c) notes, "we also know that there is a subject hierarchy but there is little comparative data on this. What one suspects is that physical education is universally lower rather than higher in the pecking order of school subjects" (p43). Physical education remains at the bottom of the heap.

Academic subjects clearly enjoy a higher status than practical ones, and Braverman (1974) feels this difference reflects the mental-manual
distinction in society at large. Linked to this, according to Saunder's (1982) is society's perception that leisure is subsidiary to work, and Maheu (1973) claims that sports are often viewed as inferior to intellectual activities. However, as Woods (1983) notes;

"Other subjects, such as the expressive ones of music, games and art, may have periodic high status within a particular school, for they have a role in presenting the public image of the school." (Woods, 1983, p71)

For many physical educators this periodic elevation has created a pressure to maintain itself by utilising curricular time to promote successful school teams with a consequent 'skewing' of time energy and resources towards the elite performer^, and Glew (1983) notes;

"By inference, match results may be seen by many as a barometer of effective teaching and coaching, not only by the teachers directly involved, but by other teachers, heads and parents. Producing successful teams can also be regarded as an important part of 'what it is to be a good P.E. teacher', contributing towards a stereotyped view of the P.E. teacher's role." (Glew, 1983, p100)

Kirk (1986b) also notes this dilemma, and points out that the underlying assumptions of such criteria are "that if a teacher can coach sport to a high level, then this is a good indicator of the quality of the physical education teaching during curriculum time" (p169). This is influenced by the fact that in many schools the subject of physical education remains non-examinable, and therefore is not evaluated in the same way as classroom subjects. This allows subjective criteria to be used in assessing the standards which give the subject its status in schools^a. In a consideration of athletics, Kirk (1984b) feels;
"This process is a feature of an approach to teaching physical education which defines the physical education teacher's role more narrowly as 'sports teacher' rather than physical educator." (Kirk, 1984b, p102)

Often amongst teachers and laymen alike one hears reference to the 'PE teacher', 'PE instructor', 'sports teacher', and 'games teacher'. The use of such terms tends to suggest according to Glew (1984), that the physical educator has an 'image problem', which is not aided by their portrayal in the media; the fantasising 'man amongst boys' in the film Kes, the 'jolly hockey sticks' of St Trinians, and the aggressive arrogance displayed in the television series Grange Hill. Such portrayals are pervasive in their affect and extend into, and reflect images of, the world of the school. Cannon (1964) focusing on female physical educators claimed that their low status was based upon an anti-academic image, whilst in a consideration of their male counterparts Scotland (1964) notes;

"He is popular with his colleagues, but for reasons personal rather than professional. To his headmaster and brother teachers he is generally a man of action rather than mind, a good man to play golf with, but not the first choice for the discussion of professional problems......he is professionally a second class citizen." (Scotland, 1964, p23)

Pressures towards elitism and concerns over stereotyping has led many physical educators to regard theirs as a 'sink subject' which has little marketable currency as a subject in its own right in the educational marketplace. Therefore, many saw the potential of the C.S.E. examinations, introduced in 1965, for enhancing the status of physical education and reducing perceptions of 'marginality'. In
considering the adoption of these exams in physical education

Carroll (1982) notes;

"The introduction of the C.S.E. in P.E. is partially an attempt to redefine the status of P.E. and the P.E. teacher. Some teachers also report that the acceptance of a syllabus by an examination board has enhanced the standing of the subject and the teacher in the eyes of the headteacher, colleagues, and even pupils. The increased importance of the P.E. teacher's role of assessor has increased his power in terms of the assessment of pupils. This is a new found source of status." (Carroll, 1982, p32)

Many physical educators were ambivalent concerning the adoption of examinations and Beesley (1983) questions the value of certification in this subject as a means to gain status;

"Instead of being a separate non-academic subject taught by specialist teachers we will join the academic bandwagon and unfortunately will not be able to compete with the more traditional academic subjects. No parent will wish their child to sit a certificate in P.E. at the expense of a subject with more academic value. The result will be a loss of status within the school as we end up at the bottom of a list of examinable subjects instead of remaining a separate but necessary part of a balanced curriculum. One of the strengths and therefore status of our subject is that we are seen to be non-examinable." (Beesley, 1983, p11)

Despite this negative view of examinations a concern for the status of the subject remains evident and raises the question as to why this is so important to teachers in schools and physical educators in particular. Pollard (1982) notes;

"At an institutional level finite resources are available, thus setting parameters for activities in the school, and these are much dependent on the particular policies or patterns of allocation which exist in each school. These will reflect the institutional bias, in particular the influence of the headteacher, and the relative power and negotiating skills of staff as they bid for resources." (Pollard, 1982, p32)
In the physical education department at Brantown School it was realised that status meant strength, and strength meant bargaining power. Goodson (1983a) considers that the higher the status of the subject, the higher the resources, and the better the prospects for the teachers involved in terms of staffing ratios, higher salaries, higher capitation allowances, more graded posts and better career prospects. Therefore, the struggle for status is above all "a battle over the material resources and career prospects of each subject teacher or subject community" (p178). In a similar fashion Ball and Goodson (1985) realise that the low status of certain school subjects, such as art, craft design and technology, physical education, domestic science and needlecraft, precludes them from the normal route of promotion to senior management positions in schools*, whilst Lacey (1970) indicates that the alternative career path chosen by many physical educators, via the pastoral system, is itself a low status pathway. The significance of the battle for status in secondary schools is highlighted by Riseborough's (1981) tale of reorganisation, in which a particular group of secondary modern teachers lost all sense of status and previously held notions of career when their school amalgamated with a grammar school.

(13.3) COMPETING FOR STATUS AT BRANSTOWN SCHOOL.

During 1983-1984 the large scale curriculum review was being undertaken within the school. This, coupled with the arrival of Alex, crystallised the battle for status for the physical educators since they were being called upon to justify their place on the curriculum
in relation to other subjects. Alex clearly recognised that this would be a crucial period for the department, "it could make or break the department in terms of its position within the school over the next ten years". The rest of the department whilst not directly involved with policy decisions at senior management level were well aware of the financial constraints operating within the school and the county, the redeployment of several teachers from local schools, falling rolls at Branstown School and the possibility of losing their sixth form, to which must be added the 'attacks' (as they saw them) on the teaching profession from Sir Keith Joseph, with his calls for 'accountability' and 'teacher quality'.

Within such an 'atmosphere' the prevailing view of the curriculum was that of an 'overstaffed environment' as formulated by Barker (1960) in which there is intense competition for time and resources, thus placing pressure on the subject area to justify its claims to either. As Monica notes;

"We are always encouraged to go on any in-service training now (by Alex), because as is quite rightly said we have got to fight for our place in the school, and looking at the scales in our department its obvious that in the past it hasn't been done."

Having realised that there would be a 'battle' to change peoples attitudes towards physical education she goes on to say;

"If we don't believe it's possible, we might as well give up trying to, and I just think that we will end up getting drowned when they come to sort the system out, certainly in this school, into a faculty based system. I think we will find ourselves right at the bottom of the heap."
Rachel recognised that not only was there competition for the amount of time on the timetable, but equally important was the manner in which allocated time was perceived to be organised or 'blocked'.

"Low status would be in a school, how the hierarchy views the subject. So if they were planning a curriculum, what subject they might slot in last. They put in their five maths, and their five French, and they've got one space left, 'Oh, we'll give it to P.E.' If you're given a scale point in the school, looking around at the departments, who would you give it to first, it wouldn't be P.E., it would be an academic subject."  

This may be linked to the concerns of many low status subjects. As Sykes et al (1985) note;

"Where practical subjects in general, and art in particular, are regarded as low status, art teachers often feel that the subject receives less than fair treatment on the timetable." (Sykes et al, 1985, p211)

The curriculum review along with the arrival of Alex had heightened Jeremy's realisation that the school subjects were in direct competition.

"I think if you just sit back and let things wash over you, we'll go down, or we'll just stay as we are. Not that we are after points all the time, that's not the main aim of P.E., but I think that it would be nice to have a little bit more money for your work, a bit more recognition I would say......It's not the fact that that they could totally ease us out of the curriculum. It would be the things like the allocation of funds would suffer, we wouldn't be getting the grant we get."  

However, several members of the department whilst recognising that there was competition for resources did not believe that physical education needed to justify it's place on the curriculum since it was
a 'core' subject, and simply justified itself by being there. As Peter, Simon, and Catherine respectively note;

"I see that its got his own place, and I don't see that it has to battle with English or History for anything, we are there in our own right, we don't have to battle to get a place in the academic stakes.......I think that most people realise that P.E. is an important part of the curriculum. You haven't got to go out of your way to get a more academic standing or to improve its importance. I think that most people realise it's necessary and that its got to be done well." 14

"I don't know why people just can't accept this is us. They should just accept that this is what a P.E. teacher does. This is what he looks like." 15

"I thought it was important (When she left college) and I still do. I don't think that you ought to have to justify it on the curriculum because I think that it justifies itself." 16

Whilst having a personal belief in the 'subject' Catherine was aware of institutional pressures within the school which forced her to justify her subject area.

"I mean everyone is aware of it, because being in the school situation, every year you are being asked to justify your role in the school, and you are hopefully trying to get more scale points and things like that." 17

"I think that this year we are making a conscious effort to try and justify why our department exists, and the role that we play in the school." 18

"After the in-service day all sorts of working parties sprang up, and if we had just sat back and let them get on with it, we would have been left out in the cold I think. So we needed to get in when we did." 19

Alex also saw that the subject needed to be argued from a position of strength in relation to other subjects, of which his proposed innovations were one means of providing this strength in negotiations as part of an aims-alignment strategy.
"I think that the work that we do, and the relevance of the work we do, will perhaps, if we are able to do this (match departmental aims with school aims) will be looked on in a better light. Then if I go to argue about the relevance of my subject and the importance of my subject, I'll be able to do it from strength, and it will give the department and the subject more status in the school." \(^{20}\)

The evidence suggests that the staff viewed the school as an overstaffed environment, which heightened concerns over status leading to the development of several strategies for status enhancement, which are discussed in more detail in the following chapters on micropolitics. The status concerns of individuals were translated into the daily life of the department in various ways which corresponded to the individual's particular adjustment to status concerns at different levels. These levels may be categorised as;

(A) Concerns over teaching as a professional group.
(B) Concerns over subject status.
(C) Concerns over individual status.

(13.4) CONCERNS OVER PHYSICAL EDUCATORS AS A PROFESSIONAL GROUP.

The physical educators were aware that the 'public opinion' of teachers was low, and not as it was in the 'old days' when the school teacher was a well respected person both in and out of school. Of interest is that the two youngest members of the department perceived this very strongly during training and yet still joined this profession. Jeremy notes that on leaving university;
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"I never really regarded it as a worthwhile job, as a profession.... I still don't know, you've got this thing about teachers, especially P.E. teachers, as being, I don't know, fairly poor and respected in school, but outside of school you didn't look up to them much." 21

"I think that we have certainly dropped (in prestige and status), I can't put a time span on it, but in the last ten years. I think that we have come down in the eyes of most people. Simply in terms of the pay we get. A lot of people say, 'Oh well, we are respected'. But in the cold light of day a lot of people look at your payslip and say 'Right, ten grand - O.K. a well respected person. Six grand - oh well, anyone can do that'." 22

"But outside of school, if you see teachers outside of school, this is the way I feel about it, that you think that they do work hard, but that they are idiots because they don't get paid. You see them driving about in 'cronks' of cars. It doesn't seem that the image is very good.....The amount of jibes I get coming in on my motorbike, 'can't you afford four wheels sir?'...There is a loss of self esteem, certainly amongst the kids." 23

Contacts with children enabled Jeremy to learn that many of their elder brothers of similar age to himself were earning a similar wage doing 'manual' jobs, whilst the police in 1984 had just had a pay rise taking the salary for graduate entry to £9,500, of which Jeremy was very aware as it indicated to him where the government had their priorities. Rachel also was aware of the low standing of teaching in relation to other professions.

"If you are talking with friends, 'What did you train as?', 'Oh, I'm a doctor'. Then if you say 'I'm a P.E. teacher', they tend to think that you just run around a hockey pitch all day, and you have never thought of anything academic. It's 'Oh, you play games all the time'. It's, you go out with the kids, they have a fun time and you come in again, and there is nothing thought about it." 24

The awareness context in the department was of a profession under threat, with the role of physical education teacher having the least
prestige in the outside community. This was directly linked to a concern over status of the subject within the school.

(13.5) PERCEPTIONS OF MARGINAL SUBJECT STATUS

This form of concern was pervasive and all the department were aware of it, electing to cope with this pressure in their own ways which had a direct influence as to their acceptance or rejection of change. In defining status within Branstown Alex notes;

"I gauge the status, I suppose it's status in the eyes of other people in the school. Obviously the most important people in the school are the hierarchy, the senior masters. Other subject areas obviously matter to us, but if you achieve status or importance, I suppose you could substitute 'importance in the eyes of other members of staff in this school'.'

Discussions about status in the literature have tended to focus on three main criteria; prestige, wealth, and authority, since it is assumed that these subsume or determine other criteria. In a similar fashion the physical educators at Branstown defined their status as very low in the following terms.

(13.5.1) PRESTIGE

The low prestige of physical education as a subject was recognised by Rachel on leaving college.

"I came out thinking that P.E. had a very low status in the school, and therefore, it was up to the actual P.E. staff to change the image.....Everybody has the idea that you just run
around a hockey field all day... So I think you come out with the idea that P.E. has very low esteem." 27

Monica felt that the majority of the teachers in the school did not regard physical education as very important subject at all.

"I think that probably the value they see in it. Let me think of a typical reaction. 'Yes - they can let steam off outside', or, 'It makes them hardy, it makes the children fit'. I don't think they really see it as a 'thinking' subject." 28

All the teachers in the department felt that the academic subjects were seen as far more important than physical education. Catherine considered it to be a 'normal' state of affairs which had a historical tradition.

"Perhaps just the status of P.E., or the status of P.E. teachers, as it used to be. It was always a case of 'Well, we don't have degrees, we don't mark books, we just go out and play games'. I still think that there are an awful lot of people who regard P.E. as just that." 29

Such messages from other staff indicating that they saw physical education as non-serious, non-academic, and of value for 'catharsis' only, were rarely made explicit, their transmission was often subtle and ambiguous. Concerning academic staff, Alex notes that "no-one actually says it", but that "there are many people, and many people who have come through the old system, who fail to see its relevance". 30 Whilst Catherine points out;

"Peoples remarks, very off-hand sometimes, very casual. When you say 'Oh crickey, I've got a practice tonight and a match on Saturday.' It would be 'Oh well, you don't do any marking do you. Your'e only a P.E. teacher'. Yes, I think it's through that more than anything else, and what you hear from other people, things that have been said and done to them." 31
The folklore of physical education is recounted by Catherine in terms of female physical educators being excluded from dining rooms and staffrooms in some schools whilst dressed in a tracksuit, and how some of her friends have been pulled in by the Headteacher to explain why the school teams were not doing well. This community network was maintained by attendance at school fixtures where this folklore was produced, maintained, and elaborated by an influential reference group, that is, other physical educators in other schools, to reinforce their own feelings of exclusion from the school's mainstream functions.

(13.5.2) WEALTH.

One of the major criteria utilised for assessing the status of a subject by the physical educators was the scaling of a department. The scales available within the physical education department were a constant reminder of their low status within the school. Most Heads of Department at Branstown School were on scale 4's, whilst several Heads of Physical Education at local schools of similar size were also on scale 4's. Alex was on a scale 3, along with the Heads of Art and Music, who were also seen by the physical educators as low status subjects. Apart from Monica (scale 2) the rest of the department in 1983 were on a scale 1, with the general view prevailing that to 'get on' within the school required 'going outside of the subject' into the pastoral system. In particular, the low scaling of their Head of Department was seen to reflect on the worth of their subject in the eyes of the school hierarchy. The two
younger members of the department in 1983 were far from satisfied with the situation, as Rachel notes;

"I think that the P.E. department hasn't got enough scale points in it. I think that Alex should be on a 4, whereas he's on a 3. So I think that shows they don't care that much, if they did they would pump more points into the department." 33

The scaling led Jeremy to conceive of it as a 'bum subject' in the eyes of the hierarchy, whilst Simon had his own 'ideal' scaling system that would reflect a true concern for the department which was not being made evident in the autumn of 1983.

"You've got a scale 3 as a Head of Department. It's a bloody joke, it really is ridiculous.....it should be a 4, two 2s', and the rest ones in the department." 34

A comparison was made by Simon with the Business Studies Department in the school, which he claimed (quite rightly) was a smaller department, saw less children than physical education, yet had more scale points.

"Well, it shows the importance of the department I suppose. It's the same as anything else, people take that as an indication, it's your prize isn't it, you're a senior teacher, it means something." 35

In 1984 Monica also had strong views on the scaling in relation to subject status;

"What we have got at the moment is appalling, and other staff would agree. I'm not talking about extra points coming in, I'm talking about what we should have without luxuries. I think the points would be there if he (the Headmaster) genuinely saw the importance." 36
In 1985 this concern had intensified;

"We still haven't got our scales yet. In fact this has been quite an issue with me over the last couple of months, because in the last couple of months a lot of scale points have become available, and they have been given to people for quite minor responsibilities in comparison......That worries me. It tends to show where they put P.E. as a subject....Its never bothered me before, but the last couple of months, I think its been disgusting." 37

This intensification is linked to a frustration at having spent a great deal of time and effort in changing the curriculum to fit in with the ethos of the school, yet no recognition was forthcoming from the senior staff in the way of scale points. This is an indicator that one of the major motivating forces behind the changes for Monica was to improve subject status. Others, whilst having similar motivations were more sceptical about gaining scale points, Catherine felt that should scale points become available they would be given to Maths, Science, or English39 since the Headmaster was trying to create an academic image for the school. This Simon found ironic since he felt that with their intake of pupils it could never be an 'academic school' due to its placement in a working class area39.

The concern over subject status illustrated the power of the Headmaster as a 'critical reality definer'40 for the physical education department. Rachel, who had the Headmaster as her tutor on her probationary year, and therefore had more contact with him over the year than any other member of the department (except Alex), noted concerning her perceptions of his views on physical education;
"I don't think that he sees it as on a par with academic subjects. I think that he sees it as having an important role in the overall development of the child, you know, the cooperation-leadership idea. But I think that he sees that as an extra bonus on the core, which is the Maths and English side, and P.E. is sort of a little extra that is tacked on the top."

The rest of the department agreed with this view that their subject was viewed as less important than academic subjects by the Headmaster. Alex felt that a major expectation of the staff in his department in terms of his role as Head of Department, was to promote the subject within the school. In a letter to the Headmaster in July 1984 he notes:

"When I arrived at Branstown School in April 1983 it was noticeable, from discussions with members of my department that they were unhappy with the status of physical education within the school, and the corresponding scale points allocated to our subject area. I appreciate that because of falling rolls and the possibility of losing our sixth form we are in an unstable position regarding the allocation of scale points. This does not deter me from requesting the recognition I feel my subject and department deserves."

The letter concludes with a request that the next scale that becomes available within the school be allocated to the physical education department, making his position that of a scale 4. The rationale for the request is contained in the four main themes within the letter.

(1) The size of the department (seventeen, including non-specialists).
(2) Part of the core curriculum with a high pupil contact time.
(3) The department was undertaking major curriculum changes and evaluation.
(4) The department was poorly scaled in relation to other departments of similar size at local schools.
Once again the theme of 'changing deserves status' is implicit in Alex's letter indicating underlying motivations for the production of curricular change in the department. The Headmaster in the role of critical reality definer was a primary target for 'image shifting communications' from Alex, whilst the rest of the department developed similar strategies to influence the members of the school that they came into contact with, and this may be interpreted as a direct attempt to enhance the status of the subject within the school. These are discussed in greater detail in the chapters on micropolitics.

(13.5.3) Authority.

The views of the physical educators in the past had not been sought or acted upon. They had been excluded from positions of power, such as curriculum development committees, where they would have the opportunity to exert influence over other subjects and gain detailed knowledge concerning the 'workings' of the school as a whole. In terms of this aspect of low status, Alex was able to understand why his department felt 'left out of things', and notes;

"Because they have been particularly put down by other members of staff and senior management, if not in an open form, in underlying ways. The department has not been represented in the past in certain areas where decisions are being made within the school, and the future policy of the school is decided."
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CONCERNS OVER INDIVIDUAL STATUS.

Within the world of the school as a place of work, it was difficult to separate concerns over subject status from concerns over individual status since the self was closely associated with both. However, perceptions of individual inferiority were evident as long as one was in contact with the subject. One of the main categorizations was that of the individual physical educator as 'non-academic'. Simon comments;

"The sad thing is that the P.E. teacher has got this image, which I'm sure that I don't help to dispel, you know 'thick as shit', 'they are good at sport but not very C-O-H-E-R-E-N-T' (laughter)(speaks with pronounced slurred voice and holds shoulders and arms in ape fashion). They couldn't hold a conversation with anything above one syllable. Now that was very true of some of the 'old breed' but most P.E. teachers now have got degrees." 45

Jeremy indicates an academic separation in the following comments which reveal how the self as involved in subject reflects on self as individual.

"Lets face it, the people in the hierarchy are products of the academic machine which they have gone through. A good school, possibly a grammar school, they go to university and are more academic than people like us." 46

"But I still feel that we've got this stigma, that O.K., we go out and we play games all day, and that we don't have any lesson preparation, and there's no homework. They are good at their job, but give them anything else to do and they are lost. They haven't got any ideas on the curriculum' and so on. I think that we have got to work extra hard to dispel this image." 47

Often as a defensive mechanism the self was disassociated from the reflective low status glare of the subject, which may be summarised
by the following approach 'the subject may have low status, BUT I have got high personal status as teacher with the school hierarchy', and this often involves an association with other career avenues within the school as indicated in Chapter 10. Once again the Headmaster is seen as a critical reality definer, and Simon notes;

"I've never been on the wrong side of the Head since I've been at this place." 48

"I've been here at Branstown six years now, so there is no more impressing to do. They have formed their image of me and I won't change that now. It's a good one. I think they are reasonably happy with what they have got." 49

"He's a smashing bloke to go to (the Headmaster), I can go to him. I know that in his eyes I'm fine - I'm O.K... But as a subject, he doesn't express it much in terms of giving us hard cash." 50

Therefore, whilst subject status may be low, the individual teacher is able to compensate by enhancing individual status within the structural constraints of the school. This involves adopting appropriate strategies to impress significant reality definers and reduce individual marginality within the organization.

(13.7) PERCEIVED PRESSURES AND REACTIONS.

Within Branstown School there were competing definitions as to the nature of physical education and the role of the physical education teacher, both within the department and within the school. Perceptions of marginality induced different reactions from within the sporting and idealist perspectives with regards to these pressures. A major pressure felt by those holding the sporting
perspective was towards elitism and the production of successful school teams, and Catherine, whilst claiming that the success of the school teams had become less important over the years within the school notes, "Everybody likes the school to win, and when they come back with trophies they are given the praise they deserve". She claimed that the subject had not really made a mark in the school (in educational terms) because the staff (both physical educators and other teachers) had been "happier to accept the winning teams and trophies". Several of the physical educators mentioned the benefits and 'publicity' value of the major games as part of their reticence concerning the new system that Alex was proposing, and Peter felt that although the majority of the staff were ignorant as to what the department did, they were very aware of the contribution of major games within the school. Jeremy felt that the Headmaster liked sporting success to get publicity for the school.

"The Headmaster I think has certainly seen the value in there being an advertisement for the school. A promotion job for the school really in the district. Good or bad, he has seen it in that light, a good medium for promoting the school, which helps us and helps him I suppose."

Similarly, Monica realised that while "on the surface" the Headmaster said successful school teams were not important, "beneath the surface he is obviously very proud when the teams do well, like the girls have done in golf, he has made a fuss of them". In relation to this the previous Headmaster had been renowned for his 'interest' in the success of the school teams, and Peter who was appointed by him retained school sport as a major means of personal and subject
legitimization. As indicated previously he did not feel that physical education had low status because 'sport' was being well financed and promoted outside of school, whilst sport dominated his perspective in school. Concerning the views of other teachers he came into contact with in the course of the school day he notes;

"The people who are interested in sport like to see the school teams do well, I don't think that they are interested in the P.E. programme as such, apart from the teams that come out in the end." 56

Simon on his appointment to the school in 1980 had found that involvement with successful school teams was an excellent way to enhance individual status and gave him a good start on the promotional ladder.

"When I started teaching I fell on my feet in so much as the first team I took won every game of the season.....For people to look and say, 'Oh, the 1st years and 2nd years are doing well, who's taking them?'. I mean it could have been bloody King Kong, it wouldn't have made any difference, they would still have won. But as a new teacher that gave me a lift, because people would say, 'It's really going well, keep it up, well done'. That surely has got to be a smaller version of the P.E. department. If you can produce successful school sides and get a good reputation, then people will look to the P.E. department and say 'well done-congratulations.' 57

For both Simon and Peter within their extremes of the sporting perspective, successful school teams were seen as essential in gaining subject and personal status. Hence, their concern at losing the support of non-specialist staff 58, since without these the capacity of the department to produce teams would be diminished. In their eyes the proposed changes would reduce the potential for success with the teams, and therefore, reduce the status of physical
education within the school. Wilson (1962) notes that the involvement of classroom colleagues in extra-curricular activities is seen as an added recommendation to their total school participation, so that what is seen as 'marginal' for the classroom teacher is vital for the physical education staff. As Peter points out;

"As far as I can see P.E. has got the status it deserves in this school......I can't see that it (the changes) will enhance it at all really. It might even come down, if the staff who are normally on games aren't going to be on games, and therefore won't take teams. It might even start going downhill rather. I can't really see why they are trying to do it I must admit." **

For Simon and Peter social contacts during the day, at break and lunchtimes, centred on discussions about 'sport' with predominantly male members of the staff who either took a school team or played for one of the staff teams. This group were a major source of identification and reinforcement for these two teachers, and there was concern that the proposed changes would undermine the positive image of the physical educator as 'games expert' amongst this group. In addition, whilst being aware of the prevailing physical educator stereotype, there is evidence that Simon, in particular had invested a great deal of energy in maintaining this stereotype within a form of strategic compliance, since he felt that this image portrayal was beneficial in his attempts to advance his career. Change was, therefore, a threat to this manufactured image with the school hierarchy who were seen to control his future. On maintaining this image he notes;

"You maintain your basic standards of dress, you always appear enthusiastic, you always appear positive, you always appear really clued in. It's a struggle sometimes when you couldn't give a damn, and you are totally not interested. You have got to give
them that image to keep them happy, that's what the P.E. person 'does'. 'He's fit and he runs around all day'. You have got to use up a lot of energy just keeping the image going. That's what people think of us, and it's ironic that we appear to be trying to do loads of other things to change the image of P.E. I'm not sure that it's the right thing to do." 

In contrast, Alex admits that his reference group and key reality definers within the school were the senior management team with whom he had more contact with than the rest of his department. This was in part due to the structure of social relations in the school, and the department channelled their concerns through Alex who had access to strategic levels of communication with other Heads of Department and senior teachers on an informal basis and in various committee meetings. In this sense Alex had an expanded information field in relation to the rest of the department who were constrained by a limited information field, and therefore constructed a different conception of the views of the powerful reality definers in the school. Concerning the Headmaster he notes;

"He's a chap that thinks, he goes right back to basics and says, 'What is your subject doing for the child?', and he wants to know that. He really doesn't want to know what the 1st XV or 1st X1 are doing. He wants to know what you are doing and how it affects that child." 

For Alex, neither subject or personal status were enhanced by the production of successful school teams, in fact this syndrome was seen to act against any gains in status from within his idealist perspective, since they could not be used as a 'lever' in discussions and negotiations with senior teachers and the Headmaster. Hence, measures had to be taken to change staff perceptions of physical education within the school, and reorientate the perspectives of his
own staff from the sporting to the idealist perspective which would allow for subject justification in educational terms. He notes;

"There has been a strong emphasis on games within the school, and it's going to take time to get away from that, and get other people away from the idea that we simply produce good teams and P.E. is just about games." 63

"If we are going to justify the subject we are going to have to justify it more in terms of what we are doing in the overall subject, rather than what we are doing in games." 64

Intimate and constant contact with the school hierarchy meant that Alex could not legitimate either subject or self in terms of the elitist rationale of school teams as was possible in the sporting perspective. He realised that the 'type' of people on the policy development committee would only be impressed by 'educational' arguments65, whilst he saw most people in the school and education in general (within his network of contacts at least), as moving away from making judgements about the physical education department based on the "sporting excellence they achieve with a few children"66. As another example Alex offers the Deputy Headmaster who is impressed by those who can put forward "a coherent argument, and can argue for their department in educational terms" 67. Hence, the curriculum changes in Alex's view would improve the status of the subject and himself with regards to this particular reference group.

"I think that it will (improve status), but it will do it in the eyes of the right people. The right people to influence are the ones who will sit down and listen to the educational implications of what you are trying to do in P.E. for all the kids." 68

"Obviously I have taken every opportunity to speak to him (the Headmaster) on the importance of my subject......I don't think
that we are doing enough in pushing the importance of our subject to other members of staff in the school and to senior management. I haven't just got to convince him, I've got to convince all the other senior members of the hierarchy within the school as well as the Heads of Departments. I have got to convince them of the importance of my subject, before I can go back to him and say in 'black and white', I want more scales for my department."

Gaining status in the eyes of the school hierarchy was seen by Alex to be far more important for the subject than the 'secondary recognition' that he felt winning school teams would produce⁷⁰, hence the reference group which Peter and Simon were influenced by was seen as having a destabilising effect upon Alex's attempts to gain status, and eventually they were removed from involvement in the physical education curriculum in the lower years by the strategy of subject reprofessionalization which Alex embarked upon once the structural change away from half-year games had been voted in by the department. In relation to competing perspectives on status enhancement, these status concerns were critical in the development of a strategic rhetoric which was to form part of the micropolitical solutions which are discussed in later chapters. Importantly, the Headmaster remained a critical reality definer for all the physical educators, and each was able to construct their own response which for the majority meant strategic compliance, yet for Alex and Monica meant strategic redefinition of which status enhancement strategies based on an 'educational rationale' were a part, and these were to have their own affect on the development of a rhetoric of change.
The teaching day at Branstown School was fragmented, and lines of communication between staff were limited and constrained by the teacher's position in the social order in the school. The physical educators only had a partial knowledge of the happenings around them on which to base their interpretations of their own social location and the nature and consequences of change in the curriculum. Within the department only Alex had an extended information field in relation to the school and educational issues beyond Branstown. He was in more regular contact with the school hierarchy and the physical education advisor for the county, on both a formal and informal level than the rest of his department, and Alex was aware that being on the policy development committee in itself extended his information field beyond that of his department;

"In some ways it has enlightened me to other areas of the curriculum, and when it comes to discussing our aims, my reading is a little bit wider, and it helps me to put our department, our subject, our curriculum, in perspective in relation to the whole curriculum." 71

The rest of the department, in various degrees, were constrained by a restricted information field. In Bernstein's (1971) terms there remained a strong 'framing' within the school as a physical entity and between subjects. The physical educators lived in fragmented worlds with limited contacts, as the following comments indicate concerning the views of other teachers about the subject of physical education in the school;
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"I honestly don't know what they think about P.E. It's like asking me what I think about an English or a Maths lesson, I don't think that they ever look across at us." 72

"I can't say what staff might believe if I sat down and had a serious discussion with them about it, because I have never done it." 73

"Apart from liking school teams that are successful. I still don't know what they want from the P.E. department. It's the same as 'what do I expect from the domestic science department?', I must admit I don't think about what I want from domestic science or woodwork, or anything else for that matter. I think that we are interested in our own department, I don't think that we go out of our way to work out what others are doing." 74

After seven months in the school Rachel only knew the deputy headteachers by sight, she had not yet had a detailed discussion with either of them on any topic. She was more aware of her House staff since it was with these that tutor group matters were discussed, but still had not physically been in all the areas of the school, whilst the majority of her social contacts in the staffroom revolved around the interest area of 'sports'.

"The staff that I come into contact with are the ones who either play for the staff football or rugby, or help out. So perhaps I haven't got a true impression. The other staff I don't see, don't really talk about games that much.....The ones that I come into contact with are involved in it (sport) anyhow, so you are talking to the converted." 75

Based on this partial knowledge in a framed world the physical educators not only constructed judgements on other staff with whom they had little contact, but also attributed motives to the each individual within their own department for accepting or rejecting change in terms of possible status gains.
ATTRIBUTING MOTIVES OF STATUS ENHANCEMENT TO AN INNOVATION.

Since the physical educators lived in an intersubjective world, their interactions were a form of engagement in which interpretation, anticipation, evaluation and the coordination of their own actions in relation to others was taken for granted. The process of 'making sense of other' as 'other was making sense of you' was important in relation to constructions as to why 'other' wished to promote or deny the possibilities for change, this being particularly so with regards to Alex.

Rachel saw the changes as part of a process of rationalization which would enable Alex to gain status for the department.

"He wants to upgrade the department, and make it more efficient. I think that probably by doing that and setting down clearly the aims, and how it fits in with the school, it will show the other staff that we actually do think about what we are doing...That we think about what we are doing. To try and upgrade the department, and get the scale points and recognition he feels it deserves." 76

However, this was often seen by Rachel as a rhetorical strategy to assist in making the department highly visible by drawing attention to the work it was doing, that is, there was no consideration by her of change in her own practice in the classroom;

"Why do we justify as much?. It seems that we are bending over backwards to change things....but we are trying desperately to uplift P.E. and in a way change everything, just to give it a new name....It's almost a case of call it a different name. It's like 'progressive education', 'Oh, that sounds good, it must be something new so lets pay attention'. Now the P.E. department is coming up with all these new ideas backed up by so and so 1953. it's going to increase our status in the school." 77
In a similar fashion Jeremy thought that curriculum change had a rhetorical potential in legitimising the subject to the school hierarchy in terms of a balanced curriculum.

"If we had gone to the School Curriculum Committee and said, 'Look we have got rugby, cricket and soccer. No gymnastics, and that's about it'. What would they have said?, they would have laughed in our faces." 79

These teachers saw the motives for the change as part of a strategy to enhance the status of the subject, others saw it as a means for Alex to enhance his own personal status in order to 'get on' in the school system by matching his career aspirations. Peter realised that things had changed since he became a teacher in 1974 with regards to the means of gaining personal status, and felt that Alex was adapting to the situated demands of this 'new' system;

"To get a 3 or a 4 would be bloody difficult (laughter). You have got to go on courses and get your name around, it's not like the old traditional way that I came into, of taking teams, left-right-and-centre. I don't think that you get on at all that way...But I still think that now it's about getting the academic type things of going on courses and getting publicity." 79

"He has to impress outside the P.E.department as well. He has got to be seen to be doing things, as a tutor or whatever....I don't think that he will get noticed as much from teaching P.E.....I reckon it's to do with administration, being seen to be efficient and organising things." 80

Peter felt that within the educational system in general, and at Branstown School in particular, simply being innovative was seen in a positive light by the senior management 81 and was a useful tactic for any newcomer to a school who wanted to 'make an impact';
"It does seem very much to me that these people have to promote some kind of change, whatever it is, just to justify being there I must admit. Essentially Alex is looking to get out. He applied for quite a few jobs last year (1985)."

Similarly, Catherine felt that one of the reasons that Alex was keeping up to date with what was going on in the field of education in general, was because he was applying for more senior positions in the educational system. Simon also saw the changes as a strategy for self enhancement by Alex in terms of career aspirations, and in considering why Alex was promoting changes in the curriculum he notes;

"Well, for changes sake in some respects, because if you come into a school like this, and it's obvious that the department has been run well, in order to make a name for yourself, or to get yourself noticed, you make changes....'I'm here, now sit up and take notice'......I think that a lot of ideas are taken on because Alex wants to make a name for himself and get noticed, 'This is the school, we are going forward'."

However, Simon realised that in order to gain personal status as Head of Department, that Alex would have to promote the status of the department and subject as a whole. This collective aspect of status enhancement for Alex was not essential for the rest of his department, since they were able to pursue status in a more individualistic manner by opting to invest in areas outside of physical education as a subject, this was not possible for Alex. As Simon notes;

"He is single minded, and I'm sure that he knows where he wants to take himself, but in order to get himself there, he has to get the department there. So he has got to take on new ideas. I suppose you could call it 'pampering to the advisor of the time'. ....It's about public relations more than anything else."
The evidence suggests that the dominant perception of the physical educators within the department at Branstown School was that of 'marginality'. Stonequist (1961) utilised this term to define roles in an organizational setting which are peripheral to the main functions of the institution. Within such roles individuals can be alienated, and since their roles are not clearly defined they may be subject to type-casting, role pressures and role strain. Hendry (1975) investigated the topic of marginality in relation to physical education, noted the diverse expectations of teachers and the numerous interactions required in this role. His analysis concluded with an attempt to link 'personality structures' with situational constraints;

"The physical education teacher's own temperament provides him with certain mechanisms for resolving the social context of his role enactments. The coping process employed appears to be one of conformity to the more powerful role demands within the school." (Hendry, 1975, p470-471)

In a similar fashion Wardell (1955) considers that individuals over time come to terms with organizational values resulting in conformity. The view held by Hendry (1975) of the physical educator as a professional strategist is insightful and useful, but unfortunately it rests upon an somewhat overdetermined conception of role performance, in which the teacher is portrayed as merely being able to adjust to institutional pressures. In view of their marginality he suggests that the response is either that of accepting the role (without gaining any power or influence), or to
develop coping mechanisms to contain the constant role strain, the final option being 'escape' via 'horizontal promotion' (presumably into the pastoral system).

By building upon the theoretical model of Getzels and Guba (1957), Hendry (1975) implicitly adopts their deterministic version of role, which analyses role performance and social behaviour in terms of the formula 'role-plus-personality'. However, as Yablonsky (1957) realised, very few roles are so explicitly defined for an actor that he/she can mechanically act out its specifications within a situation, and even when certain roles are highly explicit, a shift in the structure of the situation has an effect on the actor and requires some measure of spontaneity. This is not to deny that a great deal of teacher behaviour does take place within roles and role structures, but to argue that due to this our behaviour is role-determined is an unjustifiable distortion of role theory in which the main weakness is that it essentially ignores the interactional nature of a role performance and social behaviour as illustrated by Mead (1934). The role-plus-personality model appears to overlook the fact that when human beings act they are seeking to achieve certain goals, which are often not just personal to the individual actor but are socially mediated.

The physical educators at Branstown School did wish to achieve certain goals, in terms of the individual and the department which were both socially mediated, the main ones being to enhance personal and subject status. In this context their reaction to curriculum
change displayed not only the conformity that Hendry(1975) talked of, but went well beyond the confines of his model in the formation of a strategic redefinition, which facilitated meeting their interests at hand, and long term interests. From within both perspectives in the department, involvement in innovation was seen a positive means to enhance status, however, the level of this involvement needed only to be superficial since dealings with other teachers and senior staff in relation to managing impressions linked to status were limited to the educational context of the school. Hence, even though several of the physical educators disagreed with the proposals for change, and had no intention of changing their teaching practice, they saw its value in certain situations for enhancing their individual status. This awareness enabled the innovative ideas to be used creatively by all the physical educators as a way of coping and strategically redefining their status position in the school. The development of a pragmatic coping strategy within the department was not without its own conflicts as the sporting and idealist perspectives clashed throughout the year, and the resolution of this conflict in terms of micropolitical solutions is considered in the next three chapters.
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MICROPOLITICAL SOLUTIONS
CHAPTER FOURTEEN (MICROPOLITICS 1)

ATTEMPTING TO DOMINATE REALITIES
The previous chapters clearly indicate that within the department at Branstown School there were divergent interests in relation to the central concerns that emerged as a consequence of the curriculum changes that Alex attempted to introduce. The competing definitions of subject pedagogy and paradigm contained within the idealist and sporting perspectives highlighted the differential costs and rewards of change for each individual involved, in terms of how it affected the teacher personally with regards to time, energy, new skills, sense of excitement and competence, and interference with existing priorities. The emergent concerns of those in the department were similar to those of Brown and McIntyre's (1982) science teachers involved in change, which focused upon:

"Whether or not the innovations provided the opportunity and conditions for the teacher to do an effective and satisfying job. Would their training and competence be adequate? Would the substance of the innovation reflect their specialisms, skills and interests, and so be rewarding to teach? To what extent were they being asked to put considerable effort into changing their familiar and preferred ways of teaching in order to achieve something that they did not regard as valuable." (Brown and McIntyre, 1982, p11)

As Lortie (1975) recognised, for many teachers proposals of change are seen as frivolous since they do not address issues of boundedness, psychic rewards, time scheduling, student disruption, interpersonal support and so forth. Likewise, House (1974) points out that there is little reason for teachers to believe in change since
it often involves high personal costs and few incentives to make such an investment worthwhile.

"Innovations are an act of faith. They require that one believe that they will ultimately bear fruit and be worth the personal investment, often without hope of an immediate return." (House, 1974, p73)

To polarise the issue at Branstown, Alex and Monica definitely 'believed' in the innovations they were proposing, just as Simon and Peter did not 'believe' and hoped for a speedy return to the old system. Rachel, Jeremy and Catherine were unsure of the costs and rewards involved at times but in the end voted in favour of the innovations. The critical question was raised by Simon himself, "Somebody stands to gain a hell of a lot out of all these changes, they bloody well must do or they wouldn't be working so hard to bring it all in. One things for sure, I don't stand to get much out of it, bugger all really". This centres on the issue of whose definitions of reality prevails when there are competing interests contained within the social situation, and is linked to one of the core categories to emerge in the study, that 'change is micropolitical'.

Morgan (1986) proposes that all organizations are intrinsically political in the sense that ways must be found to create order and direction amongst people with potentially conflicting interests.

"In contrast with the view that organizations are integrated rational enterprises pursuing a common goal, the political metaphor encourages us to see organizations as loose networks of people with divergent interests who gather together for the sake of expediency e.g. in making a living, developing a career, or pursuing a desired goal or object." (Morgan, 1986, p154)
Based upon the divergent interests and situated concerns made evident at Branstown School, which rose to the surface in a time of change as opposed to remaining "subterranean issues" during periods of stability, the micropolitics of the school provided the context for an interpretation of the emergent 'solutions' developed by the teachers involved. Hoyle (1982) defines micropolitics as:

"Embracing those strategies by which individuals and groups in organizational contexts seek to use their resources of power and influence to further their interests......It is characterised more by coalitions than by departments, by strategies than enacted rules, by influence rather than power, and by knowledge rather than status." (Hoyle, 1982, p88)

At Branstown School the various strategies made evident were seen by the researcher to be developed as 'ways of achieving goals' which were then conceptualised within the framework of 'coping'. Hence, the teachers were seen as both creative and constructive in their adaptations to the daily problems within their world of work, which entailed them all being involved in political actions, since the pursuit and maintenance of interests and priorities with regards to innovation is an interactive political process. As Bacharach and Lawler (1980) note, "politics in organizations invokes the tactical use of power to obtain control of real or symbolic resources" (p1).

Accordingly the physical educators manipulated the power and influence resources available to them within the school, and within the department as the innovations developed within a micropolitical matrix. The following three chapters are an attempt to draw together
several emergent micropolitical themes related to the innovations, and include, (1) Alex's attempts to dominate the reality of the department and the reaction of staff resistance, (2) attempts to professionalize the subject area of physical education, and (3) the development of a strategic rhetoric to enhance both subject and personal status within the educational context of the school, whilst allowing for the possibility of little or no change in classroom practice as teacher autonomy is maintained.

(14.2) SIGNIFICANT MICROPOLITICAL MOMENTS.

The following have been selected as significant micropolitical moments by the researcher in terms of his interpretation of the reactions of the physical educators to the proposed innovations, and should act as a guide for the reader in relation to the following three chapters.

February 1983, Monica as Acting Head of Physical Education attempts to remove half-year games from the curriculum. The department vote unanimously not to change the present system.

April 1983, Alex arrives in the department. During summer terms no conception of major changes to the curriculum.

June 1983, Monica 'encouraged' by Alex to attend a course on the physical education curriculum at Leeds University. Returns as an 'ally', and a source of reference concerning previous attempts to create change in the department plus identify possible areas of resistance.

Summer holidays 1983, on working out the timetable Alex realises there is an imbalance in the content of the curriculum, on the mens side in particular, in terms of his idealist perspective.

September 1983, Alex gets a 'culture shock' and is unable to find self expression in the prevailing curriculum which he defines as 'elitist', and forces a crisis of self. Decides that
changes will have to be made, and that he will adopt a
democratic management style in the process. Form of changes
unclear at this stage.

November 11th 1983, In-service-day at school. Alex attempts to
gain an agreement from the department that there is an
imbalance in the curriculum, which has too much on major team
games for the boys and not enough individual activities. Meets
with strong staff resistance, from Peter and Simon in
particular. Alex loses temper in the meeting, and from then on
begins to adopt an autocratic management style in relation to
his proposals for change.

Mid-November 1983, 'decides' that removing half-year games
containing the top-group is essential to move the curriculum
towards his 'ideal' curriculum, and sees it being replaced by
mixed ability tutor-groups. Approaches Mike Donovan (Deputy
Headteacher in Charge of Timetabling) without informing the
department to find out if such a change is feasible. Its
feasability is confirmed. Alex is elected chairman of the Lower
School Curriculum Working Party.

Late-November 1983, Alex starts to introduce possibility of
removal of half-year games from the curriculum in September
1984.

December 1983, Alex increases the pressure during departmental
meetings for the removal of half-year games. Towards the end of
the month this proposal is passed by a majority vote at a
departmental meeting, with only Simon (and Peter in absentia)
voting against the change.

Christmas holiday 1983, Alex has several meetings with Mike
Donovan to finalise removal of half-year games. Realised that
due to organisational constraints of staffing and second subject
commitments, that the new system will work most efficiently if
only have specialist physical education staff teaching in the
first three years. This chance is accepted and seized upon by
Alex as part of his strategy to reprofessionalise the subject
area.

January 1984, Alex informs department at weekly meeting that
years 1-3 will be staffed by specialist physical educators only,
as from September 1984. Meets with dissent from several of the
department.

February 1984, Alex and Monica have a meeting with Len Almond a
lecturer in the Department of Physical Education and Sports
Science at Loughborough University, in which he provides a
rationale for changing the curriculum.

April 1984, Jeremy attends Blackpool Easter School course on
'managing a department', the course content confirms a great
deal of what Alex is attempting, and Jeremy returns and confirms his movement towards the idealist perspective.

June 1984, Alex begins to exclude Monica from central involvement in the department.

July 1984, Simon appointed as Scale 2 Deputy Head of Year, to start in September 1984. Two major departmental meetings are held after school to discuss the curriculum for the next academic year, Curriculum Meeting 1 (7/7/84), and Curriculum Meeting 2 (12/7/84), both created tension and resistance which was made manifest and led to open confrontations.

September 1984, curriculum changes implemented.

September 1985, Catherine and Jeremy are promoted out of the school and Alex begins his 'recruitment' campaign to bring in staff who hold an idealist perspective and will support his views on change. Peter is promoted to Scale 2 Deputy in Charge of Timetable, and becomes less of a threat to the changes.

July 1986, Alex 'facilitates' the promotion of Rachel to another school as a means of removal.

September 1986, Alex attempts to remove Simon from the department by 'encouraging' him to apply for a post at a local school, plus provides 'less than true' references.

(14.3) PRESSURES ON THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT TO DOMINATE REALITIES.

In order to create change within the department Alex felt he had to reorientate the perspectives of his staff from a sporting to an idealist perspective, which involved an attempt to dominate the realities of those within the department. This attempt at domination needs to be set in the context of the history of the department, which until his arrival was characterised by conflict, and certain tensions still remained between Monica and Simon and Peter. By September 1983 Alex felt that he had achieved his first objective of pulling the department together so that they were "willing to work
with each other" 9, and it was from this period onwards that Alex began to initiate changes within the department, despite his promise on appointment to his staff to 'look' at the department for at least a year before introducing changes 10. Various pressures of which Alex was aware influenced him to reduce this time scale and led to the imposition of his reality on the department so that the desired changes could be implemented in September 1984.

Firstly, Alex actively disliked the ongoing system at Branstown School when he arrived, it negated the articulation of his idealist perspective, and denied expression to a central aspect of his self" 11. It also reflected the 'wrong' image of Alex in his eyes to visitors to the department who assumed that as Head of Department, it was he who had developed an elitist system. Secondly, pressures were placed upon him by his own department to improve the status of the department in relation to the scaling 12, however, with the system in operation in 1983 Alex felt that he could not negotiate with the Headmaster for more scales;

"...because I would like to have the department running as best, or the way I see it should be running, before I go in and make any real claims as to having the scales we should have in the department." 13

In a reflective consideration in 1986 Alex outlines how the elitist system in operation in 1983 acted against any status gains for either subject or individual, and reduced his ability to negotiate with senior staff.

"I can always justify P.E. on the curriculum, I can sit down and argue that for hours. But my justification for P.E. was not
reflected in the curriculum......really I was finding myself less
and less able to justify my subject in the school. I was in a
very weak position to argue against other subjects for time and
resources. What I was arguing in terms of physical education
was not happening in my department, at the time it wasn't being
backed up....The fact was, luckily in many ways at the time, was
that a lot of people could not see it anyway, they weren't
looking so much at the department as at me, but if they had
early on they could have shot me down in flames." 13

In terms of his negotiations with senior staff there was clearly
dissonance' between the espoused rhetoric and the actual reality of
the workings of the department, a situation which could only remain
concealed for a limited period. In addition Alex felt a pressure to
impose change on the department, because in many ways he had been
appointed specifically to promote his philosophies. As Monica notes,
"That's what carried Alex into the job he's got now. I think that he
has done a fantastic job, but that is what carried him in here,
because he had the theory behind him"14. Alex identifies these
pressure in the following statements.

"There was a lot of conflict (in the department), and I think
that the Head thought the department was a mess, and a bit too
traditional and not moving in the direction he wanted. There
was a mess and no real direction to the curriculum, it was a
bit behind, and really needed updating and bringing into line
with school policy, and I obviously was under pressure to do
that. Having said that, I agree with the Head one hundred
percent that it needed changing." 15

"To a certain extent I've imposed my philosophies on the
department, but I was appointed for my philosophies and beliefs,
and I like to think that they fit in with the comprehensive
ideal. If I didn't end up with the majority of my ideals and
philosophies within the department, then I wouldn't have done my
job, and been seen to be doing my job properly." 16

Alex claimed that this created a strong subconscious pressure to
initiate changes sooner than he had said he would, and so, in
September 1983 he made the first moves towards producing change, beginning with informal attempts to gain agreement from the staff that the boys department in particular had a poorly balanced curriculum. Based on these interactions other members of the department assumed that Alex was under pressure from the school hierarchy and external sources to produce changes and to 'do something with the department'. As Simon notes;

"You could just dismiss this as cynical, but we go through times, and go through trends of saying 'This is the way we should teach. This is the way we shouldn't teach'. I'm getting the idea that this has been pushed from a high level. It's been suggested from a high level, and we are doing it to say 'we are doing it', that sounds terrible doesn't it....somebody somewhere who doesn't teach anymore, who is right at the top says 'Right, we are getting too elitist. Saturdays must change', and all this type of thing. So we have to find something new to do, a new set up or whatever, I'm sure that's it." 19

These outside sources were named by both Simon and Peter as 'lecturers and advisors', and several in the department were aware of Alex's career aspirations which included 'advisor or headmaster', and in this sense they saw Alex as being judged on his performance and ability to create a 'modern department' which would have to include change of some sort as evidence of progress.

"The powers that be like to see a Head of Department being able to control, not control, but pull the department together, it's part of what they judge him on, 'Does this bloke get the department working to one end', or whatever, it's middle management ideas I suppose, can he get people to produce the goods." 19

"I think that it's all to do with what Alex wants to do in the future......in terms of his career. I mean he obviously doesn't want to stay on a scale 3 for the rest of his life....Seeing Alex as I do now I don't see him like that. I think that he's looking to go somewhere quick, or fairly quick and wants to make an impact fairly quickly." 19
Such interpretations indicate clearly how several in the department, and Simon and Peter in particular came to perceive of the changes as politically motivated, with the development of change being critically linked to Alex's attempts to further his own self-interests in terms of his career.

(14.4) INITIAL ASPIRATIONS FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE NEGOTIATION OF CHANGE, AND THE EMERGENCE OF AUTOCRACY.

In September 1983 Alex was talking in terms of getting everyone's agreement (excluding Peter's who he knew would disagree) in the department on the principle of change before introducing any actual changes in the curriculum, since he felt that on this democratic basis they would implement change more readily, "If I just change it they'll do it, but they won't do it as good as they could do it". However, certain areas were obviously non-negotiable and in September 1983 Alex informed the men that they had to teach gymnastics and not divert this time to rugby, and this was an early indicator that Alex was prepared to use his formal authority to override the wishes of those within his department. Further evidence is provided by later statements.

"I have tried to make it clear to my department. If they disagree with anything I say I would rather they come out and say it, discuss it, and if I'm wrong I will say I'm wrong. If five of them say something and I still feel I'm right, I will still carry on thinking the way I do, because in the end I have to accept responsibility. I might make a decision that goes against the five, but I will still give them the opportunity to argue against me."
Whilst the initial rhetoric advocated a democratic approach, there were undertones of autocracy which became manifest when prolonged resistance to his ideas were encountered. In an essay for his Management Diploma in 1984 Alex considers the early stages in 1983 when he realised changes had to be made.

"Halfway through the year I introduced my ideas for curriculum change. My first and biggest mistake on reflection. There was agreement by some members, and a revealing silence from others. In the months that followed there was more conflict between myself and other members than at any other time in the two years I have been there. It was a time of great concern. I was initially trying to develop a comfortable and friendly atmosphere and ended up taking an autocratic line. I did not realise it at the time but this was the most obvious course."  

In a later essay he makes it clear that he had acted to dominate the realities of those in the department and force the changes through.

"Having given them the opportunity to become involved (in decision making) with no results, I became frustrated and began to introduce changes with a tendency to steamroller them through meetings. On reflection, and again from feedback from interviews (part of his assignment) this was the worst possible strategy I could have adopted at the time. I was putting up a front, stating that I wanted them to contribute ideas, and yet quite blantly pushing through my own ideas. This period saw me at my lowest ebb in this school. I could not understand why there was an atmosphere of distrust behind what was a show of conformity."  

That Alex was going to steamroller his views through became evident to the researcher as early as November 1983, when having met determined resistance from several of the department for the first time on the in-service day to his views, Alex stated without any consultation with his staff;
"I tell you what I see phasing out in this school, is half-year games and the top-group, for the sake of getting teams out, and skill practices related to matches with the top group, I see being phased out. It's going to be by subtle means." 23

By the end of December 1983 Alex had gained 'agreement', that is, had won a majority vote at a departmental meeting, that in the next academic year the new tutor-group system involving mixed ability teaching in games lessons should be introduced, and half-year games abolished. The speed of this agreement, despite strong resistance from Simon and Peter, is an indicator of the pressure Alex exerted in departmental meetings and the manner in which any other decision was not defined as possible.

Alex was unaware of the emergent concerns of his staff which were made available to the researcher in the privacy of the reflexive interviews, and therefore, according to Lighthall's(1973) frame of analysis, was unable to conceive of the reality within the department as having $n+1$ dimensions; $n$ for the number of group members, and $+1$ for the 'objective' reality of which they are a part, and which at once includes them and provides the context for their distinctive and always partially overlapping realities. 24 For Alex, essentially there could only be one acceptable reality within the department and that was his, which those within his department needed converting to, as he explained;

"To me it's black and white, and I'm trying in as many ways, just as I try to teach kids in as many different ways, and I'm not trying to draw an analogy between kids and the people in my department. All I am saying is that some of them need educating." 25
"With some of them I feel that I've got to put it in black and white, in two different areas, individual and teams. I'm not sure whether it's staring them in the face and they want to ignore it, or they are just that blind that they can't see it. I might do some bar charts to set it out more obviously. Set it out, so, that it smacks them in the face really, that's its 'wrong' what they are doing, and this is the way to do it 'right'."

This inability of Alex to relate to the fears and aspirations of the staff within his department during 1983-1984 led to the atmosphere of distrust that he expressed concern over. The following admission that he placed his own needs above all others during this period meant that he got structural changes introduced into the curriculum, but failed to change the practice of several of the teachers in the classroom.

"In considering the development of the department, and particularly the area of staff development, I have been placing the needs of my staff too far behind my personal needs and those of the pupils. If I continue to adopt this attitude then neither my own needs nor those of the pupils will be met. This problem is something that I have only recently (Jan 1985) been aware of."

An essential part of his own needs was to change the curriculum with regards to the pressures that were outlined earlier, and in forcing through structural changes Alex made use of the several forms of power available to him as Head of Department to attempt to dominate the realities of his staff. Dahl(1957) suggests that power involves an ability to get another person to do something that he/she would not otherwise have done. Using this as a starting point some theorists have gone onto study the 'here and now' conditions under which a person becomes dependent upon another, whilst others have focused on the historical forces that shape the stage of action.
on which contemporary power relations are set. Such a dichotomy in terms of Branstown School would be inappropriate since the history of the department and the individuals constantly interacted to influence the patterns of power relationships and strategies that developed within the department, which includes the manner in which Alex attempted to impose his views upon the department.

(11.5) FORMAL AUTHORITY - THE BASE LINE FOR CHANGE.

Despite Alex's attempts to play down the formal authority invested in him as Head of Department, which in Weber's (1947) terms allowed for the possibility of rational-legal domination, it was recognised by his staff that Alex 'had the final word'. It was evident that they accorded the organizational position of Head of Department certain 'rights' and 'obligations', which created a field of influence within which Alex could legitimately operate with the formal support of his staff. One obvious area where Alex was not expected to intervene was in the actual classroom teaching, whilst it was expected that he could influence and make decisions on curriculum content and structure. As Peter points out with regards to time being lost from rugby in the first year syllabus in order that more gymnastics is taught, "If Alex wants to do it, he's the Head of Department, he can decide."

"I think that Alex will do what he wants to do, whatever Simon and myself want I must admit. If he makes a decision as Head of Department then there's not a lot that we can do really. He's the Head of Department, he's got the authority to push it through, which I'm sure he will."
With regards to Alex's invitation to the department to put down their view on paper concerning half-year games in order that it be discussed at a departmental meeting in December 1983, Simon notes;

"I will put something down. I don't think it will make the slightest bit of difference. I think that we are going to do it, and I think that's what he wants us to do, is to run it for a year and see how we get on." 33

Rachel also recognised that many of the changes related to Alex's formal authority position, "He's very forceful, I think that as Head of Department he will get what he wants done, that's why he's Head of Department isn't it"34. The departments deference to formal authority coupled with an expectation that it be used by the Head of Department had its basis in the management style of the previous encumbent of this position Boris Green. As Alex notes;

"My predecessor was very authoritarian in his approach towards the rest of the department, making most of the decisions himself with little consultation. In his own way he was respected for the way he controlled the department. He has appointed five of the six members of the department and they know no different approach. Only Peter, who was not appointed by him reacted negatively to his style of leadership." 35

The influence of this expectation coupled with Alex's autocratic management style over the year 1983-1984 led the staff to see departmental meetings as an event where they would 'learn' what they were to do from Alex, despite apparent negotiations. The following extract from the interview transcript of Curriculum Meeting 1 in July 1984 provides an interesting example of the expectation of 'being told what to do'. The discussion was focused on the future
tutor-group system for games and the allocation of facilities within this new system.

Alex: I will allocate the facilities and it is up to you to allocate what you feel is the right balance to the curriculum.

Peter: What else are you going to do in that outdoor session?

Alex: Well, you can choose to do two sessions of rugby, cross-country or football.

Peter: I thought that you were going to lay it down now what kind of sessions we are going to do.

Alex: No, I'm not going to tell you exactly what you have to do.

Peter: I thought that's what you were going to do.

Alex: No, I'm just covering the areas that you should cover.....would you prefer a more rigid structure?

Peter: I just thought you were going to say it, that's all. That we had to do this, this and this.

Hence, the formal authority of Alex was clearly recognised and was the 'base line' in producing structural changes when used in combination with the following sources of power that were available to himself.

(14.6) CONTROL OF SCARCE RESOURCES — PROMOTIONS AND RECRUITMENTS.

The department were well aware of the retracting job market in 1983, both nationally and within the county, and knew that their ability to gain interviews for other posts when they did arise depended greatly on the written reference that Alex supplied. Whilst this thought was not constantly in the minds of the teachers, it remained an important consideration since in September 1983 all except Peter
in the department saw their futures lying outside the department in other schools. It was also noted that an important criterion on which the job applicant was judged was attendance on courses. Access to such courses was controlled by Alex, who received prior notification as to what courses were available, and this coupled with his ability to delegate 'responsibilities' to staff (again seen as a positive factor at interviews), meant that Alex had tight control over scarce resources.

For this form of power to be effective, there has to be dependence before one is able to control, since such control derives its base from a scarcity or limited access to desirable resources. In this context the prevailing job situation in 1983-1984 (particularly in the county) cannot be stated too strongly, and Simon described the situation as 'bleak'. The provision of written references as a source of power was made evident in 1986 when Alex, concerned over the reduced commitment of Simon to the department, indicated that if the situation did not improve then he would not be able to "support" him in his application for scaled positions relating to head of department posts.

It needs to be noted that individual power can be increased by reducing one's dependence upon others, and the promotion gained by Simon and Peter to Scale 2 positions outside of physical education within Branstown School, reduced to a certain extent Alex's ability to influence their decisions, even though they would still require a
reference from him for jobs. Paradoxically these promotions reduced their threat to the innovations, as Simon notes;

"You can see where the balance of power, well not power, but the balance has changed in P.E., Peter is taking less and less P.E., and I'm more committed to the pastoral side I must admit because that's where I see my future going. So you can see what's going to happen, he'll end up with nobody disagreeing at all. I haven't the time to be involved now." 39

Included in the control of scarce resources is the recruitment of new staff, since by influencing the selection of staff to work in his department Alex was able to create by September 1986 a department which was in agreement with his philosophies, as Simon at this time notes;

"If I went, if I left, then it would be perfect for Alex. Another new face in, impressionable in their first job. Helen, Daniel, Eleanor, and one new one, and Alex that's five. The balance is set against me and Peter dramatically, that's how he's manoeuvred, by recruitment from the outside." 40

As early as October 1983 Alex had indicated that if the chance arose, he would like to appoint his own staff to fall in line with the direction he saw the department going in41. Whilst towards the end of 1984 having encountered resistance from his department he saw recruitment as a definite policy option to create a department which would put into action the values contained within his idealist perspective.

"I like to think that if I was able to appoint over about five years my own department, one at a time, I think I would be able to adopt, or get very close to the system where all school matches will be friendlies and no league matches." 42
In terms of those who would be selected to work in his department Alex made it clear that no elitist would be appointed, since this would provide an ally for Simon and Peter to work with, which would create a stronger base for resistance to the plans he had for the department in the future.

"But it's there (the new system) and if we take on a new member of staff, that new member of staff will come into that system, and hopefully, well, I wouldn't employ an elitist. It's very hard to tell at interview who is an elitist, but I would like to think I can tell if someone is elitist....so I wouldn' appoint someone like that." 43

Job description leaflets were seen as critical by Alex in this selection process in order to make it clear that teachers holding a sporting perspective need not apply, and Simon notes that Alex "has spent bloody hours writing the damn things to make sure that he gets the person he wants"44. As an example the 'requirements for the post' sent to candidates who applied for Catherine's job in September 1985 were;

(1) The P.E. Department is committed to providing a relevant curriculum to cater for the needs of ALL pupils. The successful candidate will need to be conversant with current thinking in this area.

(2) An interest in the development of Health Related Fitness in the P.E. programme.

(3) An awareness of the place of dance within the P.E. curriculum combined with ideas for its development within the school.

(4) In personal terms we are looking for a teacher who will work closely with the team, contribute ideas for curriculum development and display an interest in the general education of the pupils. 45
As part of his control of scarce resources Alex, besides controlling the recruitment to the department, was also in a position to influence the 'removal' from the department of those who did not agree with his philosophies, or were incapable of working within his framework. Simon had created the greatest resistance to Alex since he had been there, and this coupled with Alex's concern for Simon's commitment led to a situation in September 1986 where Alex was exerting a great deal of pressure on Simon to apply for a Head of Department post at a comprehensive in the city. Alex had written Simons letter of application, arranged a 'mock' interview and constructed a 'glowing' (and essentially untrue) reference for him to enhance his chances of being appointed. As Alex notes;

"It would be a real asset, I have done all I can to get him to go, for this job. I will feel perhaps a bit guilty if he gets it and doesn't actually do anything for that school, but what the hell (laughs), it's the first time I've done it (given a false reference), but I'd be glad to get rid of him, I really would."

A similar situation arose with Rachel, who was not classed as a competent teacher by Alex, plus she remained firmly located in the sporting perspective and did not align herself within his philosophical frame, which had the effect of creating resistance to the imposition of his ideas in meetings. Alex offers as an example of this resistance a departmental meeting in the summer of 1986 where the issue he focused upon was the potential of G.C.S.E. examinations in physical education.

"Rachel was a 'brick' really when it came to her level of understanding.....The crunch was the meeting on G.C.S.E.....Rachel said, 'Do you think it's going to give them any more than they get at present?......I explained to her how certain people will
probably gain quite a lot more than they get at present......and it offers more opportunity for understanding and involvement in P.E....So I said 'Is that alright', and she goes 'Yes, that's fine'. So come to the end I just wanted a quick response about whether we should go further with it.....We went round most people and they agreed, that it was worth looking into some more. Come to Rachel and she says 'No'. So I said 'Can you give me your reasons?', and she said 'Because it will not give them any more than they are getting at present'. So I thought 'Christ - what can you do?' (makes an action as if to shoot himself in the head with a gun).....I just couldn't believe it, but that was typical. That summed it up. I had been battering my head against a brick wall for a long time." 47

In order to assist in the removal of Rachel from the department when she applied for a scale 2 Head of Girls post at a local school, Alex tutored her in her letter of application and went through several mock interviews with her. In his references on Rachel, Alex claims that he did not 'lie', but simply omitted to draw attention to the obvious shortcomings that he felt she had as a teacher.

"I just held back on certain things, I gave her quite a straight reference, it was what I didn't say, but they didn't read into that so that is their problem." 49

Alex openly admits that he was glad to be rid of Rachel in September 1986, and of his ongoing desire to remove Simon from the department since;

"At the end of the day, in terms of the development of the department it's better if they are gone....but basically it came down to I wanted fresh people in who were sympathetic to the direction we were going in." 49

Simon, Peter, and Monica were aware of this exclusion policy, and this was instrumental in developing and maintaining an atmosphere of mistrust in the department, as Simon notes;
"See, Alex was very keen for me to go for this Longley job. That can be viewed in two ways. If I want to be a total cynic, I can say that the bloke spent hours writing out my application for me because he would be quite happy to see me leave, it would be a thorn out of his side. Once I'm gone he will have it all his own way in a sense, because Peter is into the timetable now and isn't really a threat. Every change you could ever want could come in because all the new ones have been picked because they agree with him. He would be stupid not to mind, I certainly would in his situation, why make a rod for your own back." 49

Having left the school Monica in 1986 was also aware that Alex was 'empire building' and that his recruitment policy would lead to him gaining total control over the direction of the department.

"I'd be worried now, the two of us, Alex and me that is, worked very well together, and I have got a strong personality against his, and I will stand up against him if need be and say 'No'.....Now he is really on his own there, with nobody really to question him or put the breaks on his ideas. He's on his own for the first year now, he's got total control. I would be very worried now that he would be putting things in that an experienced teacher with character would stand up against......Peter and Simon have got responsibilities elsewhere so they will not have the time or the energy to put up any real resistance, they will have to toe the party line now that they are on scale 2's.....I really hope that hasn't happened....it wouldn't surprise me. The new staff were probably picked to be in line with his ideas." 50

Having gained their scale two positions within Branstown School, both Simon and Peter claimed that they did not have the time to offer much resistance to Alex in terms of the future direction of the physical education department, since they saw their career aspirations developing elsewhere. They also recognised in September 1986 that with the recruits that Alex had appointed that they would lose out in any voting on issues since they were tactically outnumbered. Alex was well aware of the diminished resistance from Simon and Peter as their career paths developed elsewhere, and
Peter's appointment to Deputy in Charge of Timetable was seen as tactically useful by Alex in his negotiations concerning the curriculum.

(14.7) INTERPERSONAL ALLIANCES, COALITIONS AND NETWORKS.

The ability to build and cultivate informal alliances and networks with those who played an important part in his domain of interest became crucial for Alex from September 1983 onwards if he was to succeed in gaining the changes he required. Such alliances and coalitions that developed were not necessarily built on an identity of interests, but rather around some form of mutually beneficial exchange. Successful networking or coalition building must not only aim to 'win friends' but to incorporate and pacify potential enemies. The previous section indicated how Alex utilised a recruitment and exclusion policy to 'create' a department geared towards his philosophy and perspective, with the cornerstone of this coalition building being mutual dependency and exchange. This dependency and exchange extended beyond the department into his dealings with senior staff in the school on the lower school curriculum meetings, where Alex claimed that each Head of Department would be defending his/her own territory the same as he was defending his. At such meetings intense negotiations took place in which subject status was important, as Alex notes;

"It's very easy from a sound position to compromise, from a position of strength to get something from somebody else, whether it's time or money. If you start from a position of weakness you are fighting for a compromise, and if at the end of the day you get it, people are looking down their noses at
you, feeling as if they have done you a favour, they've given you something. Whereas if you are in a position of strength and you compromise, then you have given them something which they owe you, and you can expect something back from them at a later date, when you push for what you want. This is why gaining or improving the status of the department is important.\textsuperscript{51}

Alex believed himself to be a good negotiator at these meetings, and felt that such skills were also utilised in his dealings with the department, where he saw the two main aspects of his role as, the management of the curriculum and the management of people, with the latter being essential in a period of change.

"If you are going to manage people you are going to get the best out of them. I think that you can get away sometimes without being a good teacher as a Head of Department as long as other people don't recognise it, without being a great teacher, or a better teacher than the others. If you are getting the best out of everyone else around you, you can justify that person being there. But I see it as a very very important part of being a Head of Department is man-management.....in a large school where you have so many people to manage, trying to get the best out of them." \textsuperscript{52}

With regards to his attempts to introduce change, Alex claims he had to man-manage several key positions within the school, in particular the Headmaster and the Deputy Headteacher in charge of timetabling Mike Donovan. He spoke of spending 'ages getting at' these two key individuals, and Monica notes, "Alex really spent a lot of time working on the Head and Mike Donovan to make sure they accepted his ideas, and it was part of the way of impressing them about P.E. and its importance"\textsuperscript{53}. In terms of the Headmaster, Alex pointed out that due to his efforts the Headmaster claims to have 'had his eyes opened' to the contribution that physical education could make to the school curriculum\textsuperscript{54}. The Headmaster was seen to be supportive of
these changes since it gave him a more 'accountable' department, and fitted in with his perception of the 'comprehensive ideal'⁷⁵. Without his support Alex realised that the changes would have been extremely difficult, as it would have been under the previous Headmaster Mr. Tallman, "If it had been the old Headmaster, I would have had great difficulty, he would have laid down barriers"⁷⁶.

Mike Donovan, with his power to control the timetable arrangements was a key person to influence, and Alex knew that he could present the greatest problem to his plans since he could have placed constraints on the removal of half-year games along with the staffing of specialists in years 1-3. As such, Alex spoke of Mike Donovan being a special 'target' for attention, who had to be 'won over' before any changes could be made, "But I have been able to win the timetabler over with my philosophy before I approached him and asked him to fit it on the timetable"⁷⁷. Besides his own philosophy there was the issue of personalities, and Alex claims "I like to think that I get on really well with the Head, and I get on really well with the Deputy Head"⁷⁸.

Having been won over Mike Donovan became an important resource of 'insider' knowledge and information for Alex, which was used to deflect and deflate challenges to his proposals for change by his department. As an example, he had checked with Mike Donovan that the introduction of tutor-groups in place of half-year games was feasible before he raised the issue with the department. Similarly concerning the use of specialists only in years 1-3 Alex notes, "I've
spent nights, days, and hours going through with the chap in charge of timetabling to make sure it works, and it looks as though it will work. This ability to deflect challenges concerning the practicalities of implementation on the timetable remained critical throughout this study since it maintained and legitimated Alex's power base in relation to creating change.

"That's why I do my best to make sure that that every thing to do with the system is tightened up and fool-proof, so that if it's challenged it can be countered. Because you only need a small part of the system to be challenged and they say 'Oh well, it doesn't work'. That's why I'm meticulous when something crops up like this (Peter claimed it would not be possible for him to teach his first years rugby in the first term). When something cropped up with the timetable, I went home and spent two hours on it, pulled it apart and made sure I was in the right, put it down on paper and fed it back to Peter to explain that everything that he said could be countered." 

These negotiations with senior staff did not go unnoticed by those in the department, and was influential in their viewing departmental meetings as 'forgone conclusions', and led Peter and Simon in particular to question not only his motives but also his tactics which they saw as 'going behind their backs', as Simon complained in December 1983;

"I mean everything I've had to say about him has been praise up to now, in the way that he's handled people.....but I feel at the moment that he has probably gone too far ahead of himself.....he didn't just go to Mike Donovan to ask about the feasibility. He's there now (Mike), he's working it out. He's (Alex) suggested that this is what we want, we do want, now get on and plan it for me." 

Peter was much more forceful, "There really is no point in discussing things if the decision has already been made from above. I have never seen the point of these departmental meetings I must
admit, but from what Simon told me about the last one (which got rid of half-year games) it’s a total waste of fucking time now” 62.

(14.8) PERCEPTIONS OF MACHIAVELLIANISM.

From the in-service day in November 1983 onwards Peter and Simon in particular became increasingly wary of Alex’s tactics to produce change. Even before this in September 1983, Simon noted;

"Alex is very good at relating to most people. He can give the impression to the girls that he’s happy with what they are doing, ‘You’re doing great girls, keep it up’, where in fact he disagrees on issues but he wouldn’t tell them that. He’d like say something to them, and then he’d come back into the conversation with us and make you feel in the men’s department, ‘That’s it, we’re there like’, and the same with the girls. But he gives a different impression I’m sure to the girls, which is just good management. He’s good at it, I can’t deny that.” 63

Three years on in September 1986 Simon confirms his opinion of Alex in relation to the changes and new staff that had been brought in.

"He is a very good manager of people. He is very good and very calculated about what he wants, and he gets what he wants out of people. I have got a lot of respect for him in that sense because he is good at it, but you often feel manipulated. He is very career orientated, extremely career orientated.” 64

"He seems to have got everything through, basically as he wanted it done to be fair. I think he saw three or four years ago what he wanted 1986 or 1987 to produce, and it will end up producing what he wants." 65

It is clear that several, of the department recognised Alex’s management abilities, and were aware that he might try to manipulate them and others in relation to introducing the curriculum changes he desired. For his part, Alex saw this form of impression management
as being important in pulling a conflict ridden department together, but it meant that he could not be open concerning his real intentions. In terms of his approach he notes, "I wasn't sly, I was quite open about what I was doing, but perhaps I didn't give all the reasons about why I wanted to change it."

The tensions between the women's and men's department were an important consideration in terms of negotiating change, and it was within this context that Monica became aware that Alex was prepared to manipulate both her and her department. One departmental meeting in particular (11/9/84) made this evident to Monica. The issue to be raised and 'decided' upon was that of an inter-tutor group games programme in the lunch breaks, which was not in operation on the men's side but had a very strong programme on the women's side, in effect, Alex wanted the men to start such a programme. He did not want the woman to raise the point at the meeting that they already had a programme in operation since this would give the men the chance to deflect attention away from the issue of their non-production and non-involvement in this area by creating a confrontation with the women. As Monica outlines;

"Alex asked all the woman not to say anything about the inter-tutor group activities, we've always run a very full lunchtime programme for girls......He didn't want the woman to say in the meeting, 'But, we've been doing this for bla bla bla years', because the men would then have said 'Oh God!'. But it was the case, we had been doing it, so we all sat silent as asked.....then it got put through....When it came up the next week in a departmental meeting, where we were going to decide where the clubs were going to go, suddenly it was in that the boys were to have all their activities in the first term, which meant that there were no facilities available for the girls, none at all. It was an impossible set up.....That put me in a very difficult position." 67
In answer to the question as to whether this arrangement had been agreed upon before this meeting with Alex, she notes.

"Well, it was agreed but we were told to shut up and not say anything.....In fact Rachel did, 'Oh yes, so what you mean we are going to do is this', and Alex was furious about it. But nothing else was said, and now he's carried that previous meeting...I said I feel as if I have been double crossed here."

Hence, Monica became aware that Alex was prepared to manipulate her in order to introduce the changes he wanted, and Alex admits that Monica was a useful ally at times, particularly since she had tried to introduce the removal of half-year games during the Easter term of 1983, and as such provided a useful source of information, as he notes;

"I would sit down and discuss with her the changes I was proposing to make. She would say 'we had them before', and she would outline the sources of opposition. So in that sense she was a reference for me to plan my strategies."

During his initial conversations with Monica, Alex found that she was not up to date on current curriculum theory since she had been on no courses, therefore, "a lot of what I was saying, with no disrespect to her was right over her head". Accordingly, as part of his manipulations of her Alex was instrumental in Monica going on the one week curriculum course at Leeds in the summer of 1983, and on the D.E.S. regional curriculum course in 1984 at Cheltenham. On her return from the former her role as 'ally' to Alex was confirmed, and he notes;

"All the things that I had said to her, or started to discuss, came up on that course......Monica came back with a lot of ideas
which she introduced to the department and to myself. We discussed that for a long time.....That was having two people who were central to the department, myself and Monica, with strong views about innovation in P.E. and what a P.E. curriculum should offer. That was the starting point. Then we came back in September (1983)."

During 1983-1984 Alex actively engaged Monica in the departmental meetings concerned with the changes, as he put it, "I say my bit and she basically backs me up". Monica’s allegiance to the innovation was seen by Alex during 1983-1984 as an important factor in gaining and maintaining the support of the woman at the crucial meetings. The women held their own meeting prior to the departmental ones so that any differences of opinion could be dealt with there and not in the main meeting, allowing them to enter these meetings as "one group, which made us a strong force at meetings". Since Alex could call upon their support via Monica (plus their own interest gains) this placed him in a strong position to implement his decisions at departmental meetings.

Simon recognised that the combination of Monica and Alex altered the context of the negotiations compared to her previous effort to instigate change in the Spring term of 1983 when she was defeated unanimously. In the previous situation he notes;

"There was no secure base for her to secure to. She couldn’t ally herself to me because I didn’t agree with her. But now you have got Alex and Monica together, then one can look to the other for support, and it’s a strong base to build from, and you can persuade other people then......outside the meetings, either speak to people during the week, or finding their views on things."
By March 1984 Alex had conducted several informal but directed 'chats' with each of his department except Simon and Peter, and admits that these had the direct intention of helping them to clarify and 'understand' his views. Of particular interest was Jeremy since Monica and Alex early on felt that he might be persuaded by Simon and Peter to vote against the changes, but due to the history of the department Monica felt that Alex would be able to influence Jeremy towards his own idealist perspective, "He'll pull Jeremy over definitely, because he is ready to be picked up. He's looking for guidance, and he has had a rough time over the last year from Simon and Peter, he is a bit anti them I think." Alex considered Jeremy to be "floating around, desperately seeking guidance and direction, which due to the history of the department he hasn't got." Indeed Jeremy whilst admitting to being confused over the issues involved, did vote on all occasions in support of Alex and the changes.

(14.9) EXCLUSION OF AN ALLY FROM CENTRAL INVOLVEMENT TO ENHANCE POLITICAL CREDIBILITY.

Alex confirms that Monica was of tactical use in helping to introduce the structural changes in 1983-1984, it was also recognised that politically she could also be a liability in negotiations within the school, and during a retrospective consideration in 1986 of Monica's role in the innovations when he arrived at the school he notes;
"Monica wasn't that valuable, at times in fact she was a liability, because Monica had been seen throughout her time at the school, and particularly at the time that Boris Green left and I came, as someone who was making the decisions and yet didn't have the intelligence or depth of knowledge and understanding herself to impose change. She tried to impose the change from half-year games to P.E......and couldn't explain the reasoning behind it, and couldn't convince the others. They were thrown out because she didn't have the ability to make a strong argument for it......she couldn't put the points over, and couldn't handle it when challenges were made by the men......Support from Monica helped me gain support from the women, but gained instant animosity from the men, it was a personal thing, and my problem was always post-meeting detaching the personal side."

It was recognised by the department that although Monica was extremely enthusiastic and supportive of Alex, that she could not 'think on her feet' and articulate her views in the coherent and forceful manner that he could. Her dogmatic approach meant that Alex on several occasions had to placate senior members of staff with whom Monica had created tension. One such senior teacher asked Alex if Monica was 'thick', to which Alex replied that she was not "super intelligent, sometimes common sense comes very difficult to her. On this occasion she totally lacked any diplomacy". Monica's diplomatic skills again caused concern for Alex in July 1984 when she created a great deal of tension with Mike Donovan the Deputy Head in Charge of Timetabling, concerning the rearrangement of Simon's teaching timetable due to his promotion to Deputy Head of Year, which necessitated his removal from 6th year games. Monica was adament that this should not be done and approached Mike Donovan on several occasions to strongly air her views, which meant that Alex had to spend a great deal of time after this with him attempting to 'smooth things over', since as indicated this
individual held a key position in terms of facilitating further curriculum changes for Alex. This and several other instances meant that Alex more and more began to define Monica's support as problematic in departmental relations and negotiations with the school hierarchy, due to her lack of diplomacy and inability to put forward a coherent philosophy. He notes;

"I've got a lot of respect for Monica because she is committed, she's got the kids interests at heart all the time, and she's got similar ideas on how we should achieve that. But I don't think that she will ever get any further in her career, she might get a Head of Girls P.E., but she would never get an overall Head of P.E. because she has no diplomacy. She will not compromise on anything, and also she hasn't got the intelligence to take it all in very quickly and respond in the right way......She might have a coherent philosophy in her mind but when questioned she gets flustered, and that's why Simon and Peter can tear her apart." 80

Peter claimed that Monica was "Not the brightest of women" 61, whilst Simon felt;

"She's very likeable, but you have got to be more than that to be a Head of Department, you have got to be able to 'wheel and deal' with all the different factions in the school, and Monica would just upset too many, she's too blunt and open......I don't think that he (Alex) has a lot of respect for her, in fact I know he thinks that she is a bit dim, and a liability at times in dealing with the Head and the rest of them." 62

Knowing that Monica found it difficult to articulate her views was seen by Simon and Peter as a weakness to be exploited and manipulated, as Simon admits, "To be honest I love stirring Monica up. I've also learnt by now that she finds it awkward to chair a meeting, so that when she does chair a meeting she is 'fair game' to have a go at" 63. An excellent example of this is provided by the departmental meeting on 9/2/84 when Alex gave a twenty minute talk
focusing on his interpretation of a rationale for physical education based on his meeting with Len Almond at Loughborough University several days previously. Having completed his talk Alex left to attend another meeting, leaving Monica to chair the proceeding discussion. As soon as Alex left Simon raised several objections to the content of what had been said, and in her attempts to counter these objections Monica introduced a point that was irrelevant (the scaling of the department) to the content of what Alex had to say and wanted the remainder of the meeting to focus upon, which allowed Simon to deflect the whole direction of the meeting away from what Alex had wanted discussed. This diversion took place within one minute of Alex leaving the room.

Alex utilised her support up until midway through the summer term 1984, that is, until such time as all the structural changes that he wanted had been agreed upon, and then began the exclusion of Monica from central involvement within his management strategy. The most obvious instance of this was her exclusion from assisting with the timetable construction for 1984-1985. Alex notes;

"I did it all myself. There is no other way it can work, there is one system for it to work. I couldn't say 'You sort out the girls and I'll sort out the boys'. Even if she did take it, she might spend a week on it and come up with a system, but it can only be one system. Now, if she came back with a system that wasn't right, I would have to take it off her, finish it, do it. So there is no other way it can be done. There is only one way I can get it together. So I went away and did it, and I think that she was a bit annoyed because the year before she did the whole timetable." 

Monica's view of the incident was;
"I hit the roof on the last day of term, because I had always had a lot to do with the timetable.....This year on the last day of term I got presented with the timetable. I kept saying, 'Don't forget I want to have something to do with the timetable', or, 'When are we going to do the timetable', and on the last day of term I got given the timetable, 'That's the timetable!'. I got presented with the timetable and I was furious about it."

This was not the first incident to make Monica aware of her own exclusion, and in comparing her involvement before Alex came to the school with her involvement in September 1984, she notes;

"I suppose it's odd, because when I started at the school I had a lot to do with the whole department, because Boris always insisted that we had a meeting once a week so that when we had a departmental meeting the two of us would be tight. Then Boris left and I actually ran the department and Simon and I worked on the same system......(now) what's happened is that I've become completely detached from the organization of the P.E. department......What's happened with me is that I've gone from having a lot to do, having everything to do, having quite a bit to do when he (Alex) came, now I have nothing to do....I'm now in the position of having the title of responsibility for girls P.E. and I'm supposed to have a lot to do with the running of the whole department, and I'm just not part of it any more, I don't have that responsibility, I don't have that challenge."  

Concerning the timetable incident on the last day of term (summer 1984), Catherine informed the researcher that Monica was 'in tears' when she arrived back in the changing rooms having received her timetable from Alex, and felt 'very hurt and used'. This was a point that Catherine agreed with, feeling that Alex had not been fair in his treatment of Monica and had just used her to achieve his own ends. The manipulation of Monica had not gone unnoticed by those in the mens department either, and Simon notes;

"That's probably where I see him (Alex) at his worst. He said things to us afterwards, and made it quite obvious to the blokes that really she was a pain in the ass (laughs), but to her face he gave her the impression that it was all her own ideas and that she was some kind of high flyer, and that's just rubbish,
you must know that from talking to her. She's a bloody liability at times because she just shoots her mouth off, but doesn't think. Having said that, I think that Alex used her, he certainly did, no doubt about it."

The manipulations of informal networks and individuals within the department by Alex continued to maintain an atmosphere of mistrust with regards to his motives and tactics in relation to the curriculum changes, which was compounded by his utilisation of various sources of power in an attempt to influence the outcomes of those departmental meetings that focused on specific proposals for change. Such manipulation allowed several of the department to divorce themselves from the content of the innovations and withdraw into the private and autonomous world of the classroom where their sporting perspectives remained intact and was articulated in their unchanged practice of teaching.

(14.10) CONTROL MECHANISMS AT DEPARTMENTAL MEETINGS.

(14.10.1) CONTROL OF DECISION MAKING PREMISES.

The ability to influence the outcomes of the decision making process is an important source of power and has attracted considerable attention within the organizational theory literature, which indicates that this form of influence has as much to do with preventing crucial decisions being made, as well as fostering desired outcomes. The dominant arena for decision making at Branstown School for the physical educators was the departmental
meetings held on Friday lunchtimes. Here Alex controlled the issues to be included on the agenda, and therefore had control over decision premises, that is, the issues that were to command attention. As examples, the minutes of the departmental meetings for 30/9/83 and 2/12/83 indicate the manner in which Alex used to introduce the theme for the meeting in his opening statement.

"Alex - introduced brief for annual departmental report. Felt that the department were not fully aware of the overall aims and objectives of the school and would not be able to refer to them if approached." (30/9/83)

"Alex - asked for opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of the present system of half-year games." (2/12/83)

In addition, Alex also often utilised particular meetings to act as a platform to define relevant issues for discussion at future meetings. His opening words to the department at the meeting when he presented an overview of Len Almond's rationale for including physical education on the school curriculum (after meeting with him on 7/2/84), gave warning that the content of his talk contained issues that would be discussed at forthcoming meetings.

"A lot of this is what I got on Tuesday from Len Almond, but I have added bits and pieces of my own notes to it. The way I see the day up there is just a consolidation of what I have been thinking and talking about for a couple of months now. I felt that I wanted to talk to you about it before you made some contributions to what we are going to teach in the first three years."  

On having to leave the meeting early to attend another he adds;

"I've got to go now because I've got to go to another meeting....But there is a justification there for PE and a plan of a PE curriculum in a comprehensive school. You can either slate it or come up with other ways of positively justifying it, or other ways of basing a curriculum, then I'd like you to discuss it....So if you could turn it over in your minds I would appreciate it."
Alex's personal written notes for this meeting reveal an eight point plan, which lists the critical issues to be raised by him, and include 'games for understanding', 'health related fitness', plus 'personal and social development'. On those occasions when he could not attend departmental meetings, such as on 19/2/84 when he was hospitalised for a minor nose operation, Alex gave Monica a list of prepared points that she should raise, that is, Alex still maintained control of the decision premises even when he was absent. For this meeting her guide to the key issues for discussion were as follows.

1. Are we producing the type of pupil with the right attitude to physical activity, health and fitness?

2. If 'yes', are we producing enough of them?.

3. A look at the present 5th year will help you here.

4. If we are not producing enough of them with the right attitude, how can we change the content of the curriculum to help them?.

5. What we should be trying to do is - not producing only good games players (it could be argued that this is all that we do at present), but allowing pupils (through teaching pupils activities and concepts that have some personal meaning i.e. they understand the values and enjoy the activities) to leave school with a positive attitude towards participating in physical activity, combined with an understanding of the benefits of it.

6. I would advocate that in our teaching we need to construct our aims and objectives in relation to the experiences and challenges that I mentioned last week.

7. Please bring to the next meeting any alternative structure that you feel would be a better alternative for our pupils, bring it on paper and justify your system.  

In such a manner Alex controlled the decision premises, particularly with regards to those meetings which were related to debating his
proposals for curriculum change. At other meetings dealing with more mundane issues such as kit and allocation of space for practices, he lessened his control, and issues felt to be important to the department were placed on the agenda as long as the member of staff submitted this before the meeting to Alex, that is, he still maintained control over issues for inclusion.

(14.10.2) CONTROL OF DECISION MAKING PROCESSES.

Due to his position as Head of Department who acted as Chairperson at departmental meetings Alex was also able to control the decision making process, which included, when to make a decision, how it was to be made, and how the decision was to be reported. Therefore, even though departmental meetings were held on a Friday lunchtime, it was Alex who decided at which ones during the year that the crucial issues relating to curriculum changes were to be debated, and when crucial votes were to be taken. Alex also controlled the form and the order of voting at the meetings. The voting order at the crucial meeting on 2/12/83, in which half-year games was voted out, did not go unnoticed by Simon who notes:

"I thought that the way the voting went in the meeting was very contrived. It just wasn't a show of hands, it was 'Jeremy, what do you think?'.....The first time it was 'Jeremy, can you tell me?'. You put somebody like Jeremy under pressure like that and he will say 'Yes, I'll go along with you'. Then it was Monica, then Rachel, well that's three down already. That leaves you with Catherine, and I was the last one to be brought in to vote, so by that time it was all over, and it wouldn't have made any difference I supposed...I just said, 'It's obvious it's passed, but I would like it minuted that someone disagreed with it'." 92
When questioned about this Alex confirmed that Jeremy was a critical vote and he had decided before the meeting to put him under a 'little bit' of pressure by asking him first. He knew that the women would vote positively, and did not want Simon to vote first because he knew he would vote against the change and didn't want this to influence Jeremy.

(14.10.3) CONTROL OF DECISION ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES.

In those meetings involved in his proposals for change, Alex attempted to control the issues and objectives to be addressed and the evaluative criteria to be employed on these issues. At the beginning of Curriculum Meeting 1, which was one of two such meetings Alex called for to take place after school at the end of the Summer term 1984, he clearly defined for those there the issues and objectives in relation to constructing a curriculum.

"Before we establish a structure, I think it's important that we look at the needs of the pupils and identify our aims related to the needs of the pupils. I don't think that you can actually identify a curriculum before you do that......Because of that I wanted to use this first meeting so that we could as a department identify what we feel are the needs of the pupils and relate some of our aims to those needs. Do you follow that? If we are going to identify a curriculum which we said we wanted to, or the content of the curriculum for the first three years, what are we going to teach and how are we going to teach it? Then before we can do that we have to identify the needs of the pupils so that we can link the aims with it."

Having identified the 'issues' of pupil needs, Alex proceeded to define the evaluative criteria of 'relevance' and 'uniqueness' for use within the meeting.
"And if we want to justify our subject and see it maintain its place on the curriculum, we must make our aims more relevant, and we must identify some aims and needs that are unique to it."

Having stated and defined in his terms the criteria for evaluation Alex was then able to maintain a focus on these throughout the meeting and deflect issues that failed to consider claims to uniqueness and relevance. The formulation of these criteria were often outside the frame of reference of his staff and was an indicator of the contrasting knowledge base that Alex was formulating his ideas within, which allowed him to redefine critical issues by controlling knowledge and information.

(14.10.4) CONTROL OF KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION.

All the department recognised that Alex was well read and 'up to date' on curriculum issues, which according to Catherine made him 'red hot' in arguing his case. In terms of Alex's ability to argue for change she notes, "I think it has helped Alex being so articulate and knowing his papers, and spending time reading. He is obviously very keen." Once again this was attributed to his career aspirations;

"I think that Alex is very up to date on things because he has been applying for jobs, and that is one of the leading questions. You have got to know what your aims and objectives are, and you have got to be well read in this, that, and the other, because of that he has looked at the theory quite a bit."
By virtue of his position as Head of Department which entailed sitting on the Policy Development Committee and the Curriculum Panel, Alex had access to information which was not available to the rest of his staff. Of great significance was his election as Chairman of the Lower School Curriculum Working Party which was formed in December 1983, and had as its terms of reference the following;

In the light of the current school debate, 'A Curriculum for the 80's and Beyond', and with regards to years 1-3.

(1) To examine the evidence presented by all the staff on the In-Service Day (18/11/83)

(2) To receive evidence from all interested parties within the school.

(3) To research "good practice" elsewhere by visiting and/or reading, and to assess the relevance of its application to this school.

(4) To report back to the Policy Development Committee on specific proposals for September 1985.

Twelve titles were listed in the bibliography at the end of this report, and they indicate the range of reading that Alex undertook as Chairman. Included were such titles as, 'Curriculum 11-16, Towards a Statement of Entitlement', 'The School Day - Towards Radical Change', 'The School Curriculum', and 'The Practical Curriculum', which the members of his own department had not read nor did they have access to these papers. It was noticeable just how little the physical educators read on curriculum matters, with 'sports' books related to coaching and skill practices occupying what attention was given to reading about 'educational' matters. Alex acknowledges that his information and knowledge base was much wider.
and deeper than that of his department, and that it was also significant that only himself and Monica that had ever taught at Schools other than Branstown. He notes;

"I appreciate that, not their knowledge, but their reading is very limited, because I'm involved in this other area as well (Lower School Curriculum Working Party), and because I have done a bit more reading than they have, things to me fall into place more easily than it does for them." 100

His reading as Chairman of the Lower Schol Curriculum Working Party had "Enlightened me to other areas of the curriculum"101, so that Alex was more able to formulate the aims of physical education and place them in the wider context of the school and national developments, with the latter being a strong validating force to him for his conception of change at Branstown School. In particular Alex was aware of significant shifts in the ability of the traditional examination subjects to justify themselves in a society of the 1980's, which created the opportunity for physical education to assert itself as a subject on the curriculum.

"It's starting to come in now where they are starting to use now other 'life skills' that they are trying to introduce, and other educational implications other than simply passing the examination....They are having to justify their subjects along different lines.......and this is a time when we come from a position of strength in that we have always argued on the 'social education'.....we have always offered the social education, the spiritual education, and all these essential experiences that are referred to in recent educational papers." 102

"But I see the P.E. curriculum changing not just in this school, but throughout the country. But to me it's crystal clear what I want to do, and why I want to do it, where I'm going, and how I'm going to get there, and I just want to clarify it in other peoples eyes." 103
The wider knowledge base available to Alex allowed the formulation of this wider perspective, and within meetings he utilised this knowledge base to define the realities of the decision making process as he constantly called upon his staff to operate and articulate their views within *his* frame of reference which involved the discursive mode of consciousness. Alex constantly during the meetings redirected attention to this mode of operation which made explicit his 'expert' knowledge, as is indicated in the following extract from Curriculum Meeting 1.

"But going back to the aims of education and the aims of the school. The general aim of education in most recent documents in simple terms is, they say 'to enrich the life of the pupils, to actually improve the life of pupils'. So when they leave school, in basic terms, you have improved the quality of life for that person."  

This wider knowledge base plus access to information not available to his staff placed Alex in the position of a 'gatekeeper' who filtered, summarised, and analysed the information available to himself, and then interpreted this information and reported it to his department in a form that favoured his interests (the above quotation serves as an example of this). The following example indicates his ability to define boundaries between segments of the school and interpret their significance to his staff, and here the views of Clarke Kent (deputy headmaster) undergo this transformation.

"This also ties in with what's happening within the school at the moment. Each department is being asked by Clarke Kent, who is in charge of the curriculum in the school, to identify the needs of the pupils, and to identify the aims and link them with the needs of the pupils. And he wants them to be specific,
and he wants them to be linked to their current needs and their needs over the next ten years." 106

By utilising the knowledge and information available to him only, Alex was able to define the views of the school hierarchy to conform to his demands for change, which was then used to place his department under pressure to conform to his and their expectations, and this was to be a major influence in the development of a strategic rhetoric by the department which is discussed in detail in Chapter 16.

(14.10.5) THE USE OF CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC.

The previous forms of influence utilised by Alex meant that in essence he dominated the departmental meetings both in content, direction and outcome, which in part may be attributed to his use of 'contrastive rhetoric' as outlined by Andy Hargreaves (1981).

"Contrastive rhetoric refers to that interactional strategy whereby the boundaries of normal and acceptable practice are defined by institutionally and/or interactionally dominant individuals or groups through the introduction into discussion of alternative practices and social forms in stylised, trivialised and generally pejorative terms which connote their unacceptability." (Hargreaves, A., 1981, p309)

In the instance of Branstown School the 'alternative practices' were in fact those of the prevailing curriculum, which Alex, the institutionally and interactionally dominant individual was trying to change. He clearly indicates that the meetings were a platform on which to polarise issues in order to highlight his own viewpoint, and notes, "Through departmental meetings I have tried to get the
department to understand my views. First of all, I'll give them my opinions of what I think is right and wrong. This tactic involved the continual juxtaposing of issues whilst making it clear which one Alex was in favour of, and the following examples are taken from the morning session of the In-Service Day (11/10/86) where Alex wanted to gain an agreement that not only was there an imbalance in the curriculum, but also that individual activities were superior to team games for educating pupils.

"As I said, everything that we teach in P.E. is through experiences. Where do the children gain most? Is it through individual activities where they can gain the maximum benefit from what we have to offer them in regards to experiences, because we would know exactly what we are offering them…..Or is it in a games situation where they are part of a team, and there are fifteen out there, and you are playing a game, or going perhaps through a skill practice, and then teach them for a lot of the lesson through that games situation. Where are they getting the most benefit? Where can we have the most control over the experiences they have? Is it through the individual activities, where we can set them tasks, be it open or closed, whether in formal gym, dance, educational gymnastics or swimming. Where do we get the most benefit?"

In another extract from the same meeting, Alex had once again presented a favourable image of individual activities when compared with team games, only this time linked to the contrastive rhetoric was an explicit statement of what Alex hoped to achieve so that the members of the meeting were left in no doubt.

"If you transfer that into the games situation where there must be a winner, usually there is a winner and a loser, one side wins and one side loses. There is a set task that they will get wrong, passing the ball and they drop it. There is introduced a feeling of failure, and you haven't got that much control over the experiences you are giving them. I think that there is an imbalance there, I think that it could be put right. It would need to change what we are teaching - not radically, but change the balance of what we are teaching, and through that we will have more control over what we get over to the children, over
the experiences we are putting them through, and through that we have more control over what the children are learning through our activities. In a games situation we do give sometimes vague outlines of what we are getting over in that situation......but we have more control of it and we have more chance to give them these experiences in individual lessons. That's why I would like to see a change in the balance of the curriculum to give more individual work for boys." ^109

This use of contrastive rhetoric and the ability to influence the definitions of reality of the department is directly related to the resources available to Alex discussed in the preceding sections. His detailed comparative knowledge of other schools and practices, coupled with continued access to educational theory from going on courses and being on various committees within the school, highlighted the differential access to the cultural resources underlying decision making between Alex and his staff. This differential access meant that Alex held not only 'de jure' institutional power, but also possessed 'de facto' interactional power which allowed him to dominate departmental meetings and ensured that his proposals were accepted.

(14.11) FORMULATING RESISTANCE TO DOMINATION.

Having claimed that Alex was the institutionally and interactionally dominant individual at the departmental meetings is not meant to infer that he met with no resistance from his staff, even when they were supportive of the changes. The following comments by Alex concerning the in-service day in November 1983 makes it plain that he believed that the department as a whole and the men in particular were creating resistance to his proposals for change.
"I've got my own set pattern of how I want to progress, but I've had hiccups, and I've had to stop. I had a hiccup at the last in-service day and I had to stop and talk to people, and reappraise my approach and start again. I was a bit disheartened at that one, because I didn't know, or I thought that people had traditional ideas on things, but I didn't feel that people were that bad. I honestly didn't think that people were that bad."

"I'm finding it very difficult, I'm finding it very difficult because it's such a simple thing to understand, and I think that people are deliberately ignoring it and I can't work out why......Other than being personal and saying, 'You haven't got a clue what you are on about, and your whole emphasis in your teaching is wrong!'. That's when I started to get angry."

During departmental meetings several forms of resistance were made evident. Note, these may not have been perceived as resistance strategies by those involved but they had the effect of creating resistance to Alex's plans for change.

(14.11.1) THE EXCLUSION OF EDUCATIONAL THEORY AND NON-CLASSROOM EVENTS.

As mentioned in the section dealing with contrastive rhetoric, Alex constantly attempted to get the department to operate within his frame of reference which involved a discursive form of consciousness. Therefore, it was difficult for Alex to meet such expectations when it became evident that his staff were either unable or unwilling to operate within this frame, preferring to utilise a practical mode of consciousness to assess the validity of change proposals.
As an example, the following extract is taken from the morning session of the in-service day where Alex was attempting to focus on the concepts of 'self directed learning', and 'taking responsibility for ones own actions', which according to him could best be done via individual activities rather than team games, since in the latter a great many children were being 'turned off' in his opinion.

Monica: Do you find this in individual activities or both?.

Alex: Both.

Rachel: How do you measure any activity, because a child may be analysing a game, not actually getting stuck in, but standing back and thinking about it?

Alex: In an objective way it is very difficult, but in a subjective way I think that you can look at his involvement.....the way he keeps up with the game, and getting involved in that particular aspect of the sport, but I think that we all know the ones that will sit back.

Simon: The extreme of that is, we have got people who are below what we call the top band. The ones that are less able. If you take someone like James Wright, he's an extreme of his type, less able or whatever. If you look at his involvement, his presence in the group, and the way you then teach the group because one individual changes it completely. So are we saying, which end do we aim for, or are we supposed in a mixed ability group to aim at the top band, aim for the middle, or do we spend our time with the bottom ones?.......when in a lesson you inevitably change your teaching methods by the fact that he's in there.

Alex: O.K. well, I've got my opinion on that, but I would rather other people get involved.

Monica: I would have thought that someone like James Wright is physically less able but not mentally. But quite often when we band out the kids in games, I mean how are we banding them, physically, mentally or less able?

Simon: I'm not criticising his presence there, the fact that he's in there. I'm just saying that he takes part in it mentally and physically but he finds it very difficult. But the teacher teaching the lesson, a lot of the times is teaching towards him and the lower end, and so the top kids lose out to a certain extent.
Monica: that’s one advantage of individual activities isn’t it?

Alex: (Sounding very frustrated) The question ‘E’ poses, insufficient emphasis on the whole person...........

This extract indicates how Simon, in this instance, introduces a practical example from within his own classroom experience into the discussion, which the rest of the department is able to relate to. He in fact trades on, and indeed, appeals to a shared cultural assumption among his colleagues that the meaning and the point of his example is obvious to all. During departmental meetings, as at Andy Hargreaves (1984) Riverdale School, when considering change the views of the teachers (with the exception of Alex) drew predominantly not upon the logic and principles of educational theory but upon their own classroom experience. Similarly, Jackson’s (1968) elementary teachers “rarely...turn to evidence beyond their own personal experience to justify their professional preferences” (p146), and at Lortie’s (1975) Five Towns it was personal experience that influenced the teachers not theory.

This would match the views given by the department in interviews whereby they did not value educational theory as a systematic, coherent and authoritative body of knowledge containing insights that might have some relevance to their classroom practice. They had rejected it in their initial training and they continued to have little acquaintance with it, and make little use of it in either their current practice or departmental meetings. Andy Hargreaves (1984) explores the exclusion of such theoretical evidence in his ‘cultural exclusion’ thesis.
"The exclusion, it seems, derives less from ignorance of the relevance of non-classroom matters than from the cultural pressures and assumptions as to what constitutes an acceptable account in staffroom discussion. In that context, it was the immediate, practical situation of the classroom that mattered most of all. This was the testing ground, the court of appeal against which all claims to truth and feasibility were publicly measured." (Hargreaves, A., 1984, p250)

Therefore, the physical educators did not react to Alex's appeals within the discursive mode of consciousness, but instead translated their own concerns into practical issues relating to their own concrete experience in the class which they all had experience of. This transformation was taken by Alex to be 'putting obstacles in his way' since it continually redirected the content of the meetings into a form that was admissible to the department and which evaded the issues that Alex wished to gain agreement upon.

14.11.2. DEFLECTING THE ISSUE.

Since theoretical evidence was inadmissible at departmental meetings, when Alex did draw upon such evidence to support his proposals for change, often a question would be raised which had the effect of deflecting the attention away from the central issue raised by him. The following is again an extract from the in-service day, at a point where Alex was attempting to gain an agreement that the teacher is more able to control pupil learning experiences in individual activities rather than team games.

Alex: As I said should we be saying we'll give sixty percent of our time on activities that are individually based?
Monica: I don't think that we do develop interpersonal relationships, as much as we could do......I don't think that we really fully make ourselves aware of what we could offer and get over to kids.....I don't think that we really have that in mind when we go out there.

Simon: Initially, before you answer that you have got to say that we feel 'Yes', we are in a strong position to develop interpersonal relationships. To establish that we feel our position is a strong one to argue anything from, and to come up with an answer, and say we want that, we could be cutting our own throats.

Alex: The way I see it is that......I feel that the emphasis sometimes is too much on teaching the activity, and not enough on teaching the individual, and the affect it is having on each individual. We go out and teach rugby instead of teaching children, and think of the other things that come over and come out in the activity.

Simon: Again it's difficult. If you take P.E., if you taught as much in the individual relationships with the kids........If you teach swimming, basketball, badminton or whatever, gymnastics or something else. If you teach each of those as a subject, or the subject and not think about the individuals. You can then, one individual, one team game, so you can bring them through as a block as you go, through the year. 115

In both instances Simon's interjections may be seen as an attempt to deflect from the main issues being raised, with Alex making an attempt to redefine the issue only to be deflected again by Simon's final comment. This process systematically produced circularity within the discussion without any clearly defined points of agreement which was to eventually lead to Alex losing his temper during the in-service day.

(14.11.3) THE USE OF SILENCE.

The interpretation of silence in response to his questions as a form of disagreement was noted by Alex earlier on in this chapter. Non-
response within a meeting was taken to signal non-agreement, and prolonged silence was taken to be a sign of active non-cooperation. Peter, in particular utilised silence to great effect on those occasions when he did attend meetings, and the morning session of the in-service day was an interesting example of the manner in which this tactic can create an atmosphere of tension and animosity as my field notes indicate.

"The meeting had been in session for 45 minutes and Peter was still refusing to be drawn into any discussion. He had said nothing since the meeting started, despite Alex's attempts to gain a response by looking directly at him when he asked a question. Peter's reaction was to lower his eyes and continue to doodle on a note pad in front of him, he smiled openly at some of the issues raised and the ensuing comments, and nodded his head in disapproval at others, at other times he gave a quiet laugh, but never gave a direct response. As the meeting progressed it was obvious that due to the circularity of the discussion in which Alex could not get any form of agreement, and the non-response of Peter, that Alex was losing his composure, the tone of his voice had changed noticeably, there was an edge to it that indicated that he was attempting to contain his anger, his face was red and he was sweating more than normal. The atmosphere within the meeting was very tense, and the rest of the staff were aware that Alex was in a state they had never seen him in before.

Towards the end of the meeting Alex was considering a technique in basket ball in order to clarify a point, at which point Peter made his one and only comment of the meeting, "Not really no". Alex stopped in mid-sentence, turned to Peter and said acidly, "It talks!". The room was silent and nobody laughed, it was obvious to everyone that Alex was in a state of anger."  

Monica and Catherine discussed Alex's display at the meeting the next day when they were together for school matches, and noted it was the first time anyone had seen him lose his temper. Alex in a telephone conversation the same evening jokingly mentioned that if Peter had been sitting closer to him that he would not have been accountable for his actions, and that he left the meeting 'bloody
well raging'. In a reflective view of this incident in 1984 he notes, "They either didn't want to see the point or couldn't see the point, and I became more and more upset about it, because I thought that I had put it in black and white, put it in as clear as picture as possible". From this point on Alex began to impose his reality on the department in the autocratic manner already discussed.

(4.1.1.4) OPEN CONFRONTATION.

Direct and open confrontation in meetings was rare but when it occurred it raised to the surface the underlying hostilities associated with the proposals for change, particularly by Simon and Peter. The following extract from Curriculum Meeting 2 indicates how Peter firstly confronts Jeremy and later Monica, when the issue raised was that of subject pedagogy. Previous to this extract Alex had raised the issue of games-for-understanding' and how if his staff experimented with different teaching techniques, that it might be advantageous for them to invite colleagues in to observe their lessons.

Alex: How do you feel about that one?

Jeremy: I think that I agree with everything you say, we can only gain from it.

Monica: Even if you disagree with it you still gain.

Jeremy: Even if you disagree with it yes. What Simon said earlier about taking different bits and pieces from different styles of teaching. I'd like to think that anyone sitting in this room is not that far down the road that they can't learn. You can always learn from other teachers.....you can dismiss it, but you have got to try it first.
Peter: (Very agitated, voice raised) You haven't GOT to try it first, because if you think that this new fangled method is rubbish then and your way is better!

Jeremy: What, just reading about it you think it's rubbish?

Peter: Or how else do you accept it, why do you think it's good?

Jeremy: I don't know it's good yet.

Peter: There you are then. All we have heard are the people who have made the damn thing up, and are blowing their own trumpets about what they have done! 

(Alex intervenes to defuse the situation and to point out that other schools have used this method with some success. The discussion moves to 'mixing' teaching styles to suit the teacher and Monica advocates the 'understanding' approach to gymnastics).

Monica: If you felt that the kids learnt more out of it or enjoyed it more, surely you would get more out of it, you would be happier with that method yourself.

Peter: No, who says that at any rate teaching gymnastics in the formal way doesn't get an awful lot out of the kids who enjoy it all, so why should they change anyway?

Monica: (flustered by the challenge and obviously agitated) I said that earlier on Peter! (slams down her pen onto table)

Peter: No your'e not, your'e going on as if everone has to do this new system.

Monica: (Face reddened, shouts) I am NOT. NO!, I am not!

Peter: Well thats what it sounds like.

Monica: I'm not!. I don't know. I'm not doing it that way, but I am still trying things out. I haven't decided that it is the better way. I'm saying that we should be prepared to look and see whether or not, what we are doing is right, instead of just assuming that we are correct.

Peter: Well, we certainly all shouldn't be going over to doing this then. (smiles at Simon who nods agreement)

Monica: At the moment it's like a little brick wall around us. What we do is perfect and that is that. (Agitated, glaring at Peter)

Peter: You might think that but I don't think that I must admit.
Monica: In that case you are prepared to look at other methods, if you don't think that you are perfect that is!.

(Alex again intervenes to defuse the situation, since it is clear that both Monica and Peter are becoming increasingly angry. Alex reinforces the view that many pupils are not gaining a great deal from their lessons and advocates experimentation with different teaching methods. Alex himself is agitated and is directing a 'hard' stare at Peter as he makes his points.)

Alex: I think that it's important that we look at what we are teaching, and how we are teaching it. It's not working, because of the time at the moment, we recognise that there's something wrong. So our argument varies, but because we recognise that there is something wrong, we've all done this, we should look at how and what we are teaching.

Peter: (Interrupts Alex in mid-sentence, very annoyed) Can I say that in the department there should be, how can I put it, a far more disciplined approach to kids. We, the standards of dress has dropped abominably, like shoes, we are allowing all sorts of coloured shoes around the place, shorts. There is too much theory going on and standards are dropping. My hobby horse is of course in the winter term the state of the floor in the sports hall. It was absolutely disgraceful because kids were using shoes in there that they were going around in outside. The standard of kit is not looked after. Stuff is slung all over the shop and everything else. I think this is an important part of educating kids in the discipline of looking after things and everything else, and it's an absolute bloody shambles at the moment!

Alex: (Attempting to control the temper in his voice) I accept that, but I would have liked you to attend departmental meetings, and then it could have been brought up at departmental meetings, and not allowed to get to perhaps this stage before, you are obviously quite upset about it. I also think that while we are airing grievances, I think that within the department there is this feeling of male-female animosity, well not of animosity, but of males getting in first or females trying to get in first, and there is, we don't get on as well as we could, and because of that we don't get as much out of each other as we should. I accept your point on the dress and the equipment, it's a departmental thing..

Peter: (glaring at Monica, shouts) On both sides!

(Alex concludes the meeting with an appeal to Peter to attend meetings so that problems can be discussed earlier.)
This prolonged extract has been included to indicate the tension that existed within several of the departmental meetings, particularly when the focus was upon possible changes in subject pedagogy, as this violated the assumptions held concerning teacher autonomy. Such confrontation disrupted meetings so that the central issues raised by Alex were subsumed within the personal conflicts and tensions that were expressed by his staff.

(14.12) SUMMARY OF ATTEMPTS TO DOMINATE DEPARTMENTAL REALITIES.

Discussing his conception of multiple realities Lighthall (1974) claims it is important to understand how the realities of people in powerful positions frequently come to have so little in common with those in less powerful positions. An attempt has been made in this chapter to indicate how Alex came to dominate the realities of change within his department at certain superficial levels at least. At the deeper levels of change his approach may be seen in many ways as self-defeating (which he himself recognised), since if communication is conceived as a process whereby two or more people mutually enlarge the commonality of their separate realities, then at times little communication took place in the departmental meetings (talking need not indicate communication has taken place in these terms).

Alex admits to 'steamrollering' his changes in at the structural level by the use of the various forms of power and influence that were available to him as Head of Department, and ignoring the concerns and the worries of his staff. In this sense the
departmental meetings were used by Alex to express to his department his reality, which he saw as the only acceptable reality, and it was not to exchange his for theirs, since his, contained within the idealist perspective, was so obviously 'right' (to Alex at least). However, since it was his department who had to carry the educational goals and images of his reality into action, that is, to make much of his reality theirs too at a practical level, and since no person responds to realities other than his/her own, then Alex's use of an essentially one-way form of communication was self-defeating. In order for his reality to become theirs, he would have had to make part of theirs his, but this could not be so since he defined them as 'wrong' and himself as 'right'. It would appear, however, that realities are only enlarged by exchange and not by attempts at domination which leads to resistance and confrontation with little if any expansion of individual realities from resisting teachers.

Alex attempted to provide 'answers' at the departmental meetings, but the 'solutions' provided were to 'problems' as defined by him, and little attention was given to the nature and components of the problem and how they were formulated by his staff. Hence the deeper fears and concerns expressed to the researcher in confidential interviews and discussed in the previous chapters, rarely surfaced at departmental meetings. This being the case, Alex was unable to unfold the realities of his staff from the private domain to the public arena, and was therefore forced to cope blindly with the private realities that guided his staff during the year (a point he
realised when he had to conduct depth interviews with them as part of his Management Diploma in 1985). For Simon and Peter in particular, in their individual realities, the problems that Alex constructed did not exist for them in their daily lives, and since reality exists in the _u._ and not the ±1 reality, then for the _u._ members to invest their energies in a problem, it had to exist for them in their _u._ realities, which for several holding the sporting perspective it obviously did not. Hence, Alex employed a problem solving process that consistently ignored the question of 'Whose problem are we solving?'.

Had Alex been able to come to terms with the _u._ realities of his staff, then he would perhaps have come to realise that their apparent ignoring of theoretical literature and abstract conceptualisations within the meetings, was in part because they did not understand the content of his message (in his terms), plus such evidence was deemed culturally inadmissible, and by his use of it he was violating this norm. His continued reference to research findings, formal educational theory and comparative cases within the meetings were not seen as a legitimate resource for debating questions of general social and educational importance in relation to the lived in world of the department. His attempts to make his staff operate within his own frame of reference negated their own realities and classroom experiences as evidence, which they classified as a legitimate resource, and therefore implicitly challenged their collective uncontested assumptions concerning the
nature of teaching and pupil learning which was threatening and led to confusion, anxiety and resistance.

Andy Hargreaves (1984) at Riverdale School, notes that in such situations at this school the discussions tended to become inconclusive, speculative, and tangential, since the data at hand was not suitable for considering the broad general questions that the teachers were addressing. Hence, he claims that the attempts to involve staff in educational debate led in many ways to a 'pooling of ignorance'\(^{23}\). However, this very inconclusiveness at Branstown School enabled Alex to utilise his many sources of power to influence the prevailing definition of the situation within the decision making processes to his advantage. As his staff were tied to their own personal experience as a basis for discussion, they found it extremely difficult and anxiety producing to deal precisely with those general and challenging questions that Alex was raising over both subject paradigm and pedagogy.

Ironically, Alex's initial aspirations to democratic leadership and open involvement, due to his lack of awareness of the realities of his staff, led to his imposing change in an autocratic style, which demoralised his staff and led to resistance and confrontation, from Simon and Peter in particular, resulting in little if any shift in their realities\(^{24}\). Within these meetings the staff did, however, learn the fundamentals of a strategic rhetoric which emerged as a way to cope with the pressures that Alex was exerting, whilst preserving classroom autonomy and allowing the innovations to be
used to enhance individual and subject status. This rhetoric is
discussed in detail in Chapter 16.

(14.13) NOTES AND AUDIT TRAIL FOR CHAPTER 14.

1. This is a criterion within the practicality ethic of Doyle
and Ponder(1977-1978)
2. Field notes, July 1984
3. The micropolitics of school have only recently come to the
fore in educational research, see Ball (1985), Evans et al(1985),
despite the earlier pleas of Hoyle(1982) which are renewed in
(1986b).
5. Ball(1985) had a similar interpretation forced upon him.
8. See Chapter 8.
9. A-83-1-20
10. Essay 1, Diploma Management Studies, 20/11/84
11. The aspect of 'self' involved in change is considered in
Chapter 17.
12. See Chapter 13 on Status
13. A-86-14-2
14. M-84-4-7
15. A-86-14-21
16. A-86-14-13
17. See Chapters 10 and 13, on attributing motives.
18. S-84-4-7
19. S-84-5-8
20. A-83-2-4
22. Essay 1, Diploma Management Studies, 20/11/84
23. A-83-3-2
24. See Lighthall(1973) who utilises this conception of reality
to offer a critique of Smith and Kieth(1971)
25. A-83-2-12
26. A-83-3-5
27. Essay 2, Diploma Management Studies, 11/1/85
28. See Morgan(1986) for a more detailed discussion of both
these developments.
29. On Weber's typology of domination. Under the mode of
rational-legal domination, power is legitimized by laws, rules,
regulations, and procedures. The ruler can thus only attain
power by following the legal procedures that specify how the
ruler is to be appointed. The power is also formally bounded by
rule. The typical administrative apparatus is the beurocracy, a
rational-legal framework in which formal authority is
concentrated at the top of the organizational hierarchy.
(Mouzelis,1979,p18).
30. See Chapters 11 on Control,and Chapter 12 on Autonomy.
31. P-83-1-8
32. Field notes, December 1983.
33. S-83-3-7
34. Field notes, January 1984, Rachel.
35. Essay 2, Diploma Management Studies, 11/1/85
36. Curriculum Meeting 2, 12/7/84, p15
37. See Chapter 10 on Commitment.
38. A-86-14-24
39. S-86-8-22
40. S-86-8-44
41. A-83-2-22
42. A-84-8-4
43. A-84-107
44. A-86-12-20
45. S-86-8-30
46. A-86-14-39
47. A-86-14-10/11
48. A-86-14-39
49. S-86-8-30
50. M-86-6-13
51. A-86-14-20
52. A-83-2-19
53. M-86-6-11
54. A-84-9-2
55. A-85-6-7
56. A-84-8-12
57. A-84-8-10
58. A-86-14-19
59. A-84-4-3
60. See Chapters 10 on Commitment, and Chapter 13 on Status.
61. S-83-3-7
63. S-83-1-3
64. S-86-8-15
65. S-86-8-1
66. A-84-8-9
67. M-84-4-15
68. M-84-4-15
69. A-86-14-6
70. A-84-7-3
71. A-84-7-3
72. A-84-5-2
73. M-85-5-6
74. S-86-8-16
75. A-84-6-5
76. M-83-3-9
77. A-84-4-9, Alex was the 3rd Head of Department that Jeremy had worked under in less than a year.
78. A-86-14-5/6
79. A-84-10-14
80. A-84-10-15
81. P-86-5-18
82. S-86-8-35
83. S-84-5-1

- 400 -
84. A-84-10
85. M-84-4-11/12
86. Catherine, telephone conversation, 15/9/84
87. S-86-8-35
89. Departmental Meeting, 9/2/84
90. Departmental Meeting, 9/2/84
91. Copy of note given to Monica by Alex to act as key points
    for next Departmental meeting on 19/2/84
92. S-84-4-10
93. Alex, telephone conversation, 7/12/86
94. Curriculum Meeting 1, 9/7/84, p1
95. Curriculum Meeting 1, 9/7/84, p2
96. C-84-3-9
97. C-83-1-15
99. Bibliography of above report
100. A-84-6-1
101. A-84-5-4
102. A-83-1-6
103. A-84-6-1
104. Giddens(1979), discussed in Chapter 12 on Competence
105. Curriculum Meeting 1, 9/7/84, p6
106. Curriculum Meeting 1, 9/7/84, p1
107. A-84-7-12
108. In-Service Day, 11/11/83, morning session, p29
110. A-84-5-14
111. A-83-3-3
112. In-Service day, 11/11/83, p3/4
113. Similar findings are reported by Jackson(1968),
    Lortie(1975),and Hargreaves,A.(1984). In each case experiences
    with pupils in the classroom provided the dominant source of
    justification for professional practice. In this sense teachers
    are according to Friedson(1970) similar to other professions in
    their use of 'case rhetoric' when implementing and justifying
    decisions.
114. See Chapters 11 on Control, and Chapter 12 on Competence.
117. Field notes 11/11/83118. M-83-1-4
119. A-84-7-7
120. Curriculum Meeting 2, 12/7/84, p24
121. Curriculum Meeting 2, 12/7/84, p26
122. Curriculum Meeting 2, 12/7/84, p30
123. Keast and Carr(1970)
124. The possible reasons for, and the consequences of, this
    cultural exclusion has been focused upon by Hargreaves,A.(1984)
    who argues that a 'cultural interuption' strategy is not
    appropriate to produce change since this requires a 'structural
    redefinition'.

- 401 -
CHAPTER FIFTEEN (MICROPOLITICS 2)

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF A SUBJECT AREA
That the physical educators at Branstown School were deeply concerned over their professional image and status within the school has been made evident earlier'. In this sense they shared a common concern with the rest of the teaching profession in a variety of countries, who remain unsure of their own position and status, and whether or not they constitute a profession in any public and precise sense of the term. A significant problem is the nature of 'teaching' which is less exact and narrow than those practices with which teachers often compare themselves, and Judge (1980) notes:

"Teaching, unlike surgery, is an activity with loosely defined frontiers. Those who are actually paid to do it include an embarrassingly wide range of practitioners approaching the task with different assumptions, intentions, intellectual equipment and qualifications. Some of the most distinguished of those practitioners, for example within the universities, will have had no training at all." (Judge, 1980, p.432)

Whether or not teaching is a profession is not the issue here, since the physical educators believed themselves to be members of a professional group contained within the category that Toren (1975) has classed as the "humanistic, welfare, person, profession" (p.328). However, within a post-industrial society that Friedson (1971) has claimed is the professionalized society, an implicit fear at Branstown School was that of the deprofessionalization of physical education as a subject area, and within this framework the structural change introducing the use of specialist physical
education teachers only in years 1-3 may be seen as an active attempt to reprofessionalize this subject area.

As Rothman(1984) points out the study of professions has had a long and complex history, and Hoyle(1980) notes how over the past seventy years the majority of investigations into professions have seen the function of this term as descriptive, and have therefore attempted to identify the significant characteristics of occupations like medicine and law, traditionally designated as professions, which separated them from other non-professional occupations. Hoyle(1980) gives the following as examples of the characteristics that appear in the numerous lists of attributes of professions.

"Their practice is underpinned by a body of theoretical knowledge; practitioners undergo a relatively long period of training; there is a code of ethics governing practitioner behaviour; practitioners enjoy a relatively high degree of autonomy; and the profession itself is responsible for the admission of new members." (Hoyle,1980,p43)

This lent itself to the identification of 'ideal types' of professions such as medicine and law, however, it is now more common to arrange occupations on a set of continua or dimensions on which a given profession may have different values. This provides a more dynamic conception whereby professionalism is regarded as a matter of degree, and consistency among the diverse elements composing a profession, with the 'ideal type' being at one extreme of such a continuum.
The 'attribute' approach described above has come under heavy criticism because it accepts the normative definition put forward by the professions themselves, which diverts attention from processes such as power plays and games. Hoyle (1980) points out that the term profession always carries a symbolic and ideological connotation, and that the ostensibly 'descriptive' approach embodies certain built-in value assumptions, and since it is an ideological term it has a place in the bargaining positions of occupations in their efforts to improve status, rewards, and the conditions of work.

From the attribute approach has emerged a more historical and process orientated perspective, emphasising professions as self conscious groups acting to dominate their position in the labour force, and maximise social and economic benefits. Within this framework the focus has been upon the historical conditions and political strategies employed by specific groups in an attempt to gain professional status. As Friedson (1977) has pointed out, achieving professional status is problematic and tenuous depending (at least in part) upon deliberate self conscious social and political action on many fronts. Since the conception of profession has reference to both the individual practitioner, and the occupational group as a whole, then both are seen to be engaged in political manoeuvrings which attempt to gain acceptance on one or several of the major attributes contained within the 'ideal type'.
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This distinction between the collective and individual is central to a consideration of professionalization which has two major dimensions; the improvement of status and the improvement of practice. At Branstown School a great deal of time and energy was devoted to improving both individual and subject status, and in doing so those involved aspired to certain attributes of the 'ideal type' profession. By utilising this 'ideal type' model within a process orientated perspective the micropolitical struggles within the school are made evident as the physical educators attempted to combat certain institutional forces that were in danger of deprofessionalizing their subject area. By considering the sources of deprofessionalization on the department, and on Alex in particular, the introduction of physical education specialists to teach years 1-3 only, becomes a definite micropolitical manoeuvre within the prevailing institutional constraints to defend against threats to monopoly, autonomy and expert knowledge. Essentially as Lawson (1985) realises;

"Professional status is not gained by mere self proclomation. Rather, it is achieved through social negotiations, involving contests with other aspirants and existing professions as well as with would be clients. Ultimately would be clients must be convinced that the profession, by virtue of its expertise, offers services they need but cannot provide for themselves." (Lawson, 1985p9)
(15.2) SOURCES OF DEPROFESSIONALIZATION.

(15.2.1) MONOPOLY.

Rothman (1984) states;

"Monopoly prevails when members of a group have exclusive rights to do certain kinds of work. A service is of little economic and social value if that service can be provided by laypersons or members of other occupations. Hence, professions strive for exclusive jurisdiction over the provision of specialised services." (Rothman, 1984, p185)

This exclusive jurisdiction did not apply to the physical educators at Branstown School, either within the city or within the school. Following the lead of the U.S.A.¹⁴, there had been an explosion in the 'health' market, which entailed large numbers of individuals claiming to be physical activity experts. The local telephone directory for Big City advertised ten 'health and Fitness' clubs, numerous aerobics classes, and an abundance of sports clubs. The city also boasted one second division and one third division football league club, a successful first class rugby team, and a large athletics club.

This is a national phenomenon which has made significant inroads in terms of claims by physical educators in schools as being the only 'experts' available. The coaching/teaching dichotomy in this sense becomes even more pronounced as the individual governing bodies for each sport award their own coaching qualifications and certification. For instance, in the Big City a 'private' gymnastics
club had been opened for children, and in 1984 gained several successes at the national championships (the male physical educators in particular at Branstown School did not feel confident to teach gymnastics), and was run by two coaches who were highly qualified within the British Amateur Gymnastics Association, but were not qualified teachers. In contrast several very successful local boys football and rugby teams were run by adults with no formal teaching/coaching qualifications what-so-ever. As Peter notes:

"A lot of the kids have got more outside things to do. A lot of them who play rugby or soccer play for outside clubs in the week as well. I know some kids who train 3 nights per week, and play twice, which is crazy. They play for two teams at the weekend plus club training."  

It was generally recognised within the department that for 'star performers', playing for the school team had become less important as they could play at a higher standard and gain more prestige by joining clubs outside of school. The standard of coaching they would receive would also be higher in certain sports, and Simon pointed out that a good athlete would be 'mad' to rely on what could be offered within the school both in terms of technical expertise and facilities, and he recommended that they join the athletics club in Big city if they aspired to top level competition.

Even within the staff employed at Branstown School the physical educators did not have the monopoly, as in certain activities other subject teachers were more qualified than the physical education specialists. As an example Alan Busby (Physics) was a qualified Amateur Athletics Association Coach (throws) and coached at the Big
City athletics club, Henry Jackson (English) was a county squash player, several had played senior level rugby, and one Herbert Wapshott (Geography) was an England croquet international. The availability of such expertise on the staff served to undermine the position of the physical educators both within the school and within lessons, as Simon points out;

"In rugby, give Dave Bishop (Maths) the top group and he's fine. He does more than Jeremy will for example. He knows more about rugby than Jeremy does, specific to that one sport." 17

Hence, when Dave Bishop was assisting with games he was given the 'top-group' whilst Jeremy took one of the lower groups. Such a situation did not exist for the girls department who found it very difficult to find females on the staff who had any expertise in a particular sport, as Monica noted concerning the situation when she became Head of Girls, "The games situation was impossible, with these staff coming over. A lot of training needed to be done then, and monitoring of what was actually being taught, and particularly on the games side"10. Catherine also notes that on her arrival at the school there were numerous non-specialists coming over to help on the girls side;

"It was chaos, it was absolute chaos, because there were some people who were coming over who had done it for a few years and they had their own little ideas of what to do, and here we were trying to improve the standard of teaching and cover a syllabus. They weren't really very interested."13

Such a situation was to strongly affect the women's decision to endorse the proposal by Alex to adopt specialists only in years 1-3 in terms of their autonomy (discussed later), and this structural
change was also seen as a way to combat the commonly held view within the school concerning physical education that, 'anyone can do it'. This non-professional image was continually reinforced by the presence of non-specialists within the department, since as Jeremy noted they were in no way obliged to teach an 'educational' lesson.

"There's a lot of people who come over for games who just give them a ball, stand in the middle and just whistle, and just go around in circles and don't do any 'real' teaching. That's a weakness of the subject that you can just get away with doing that." 20

It was recognised that in the sense of 'child minding' anyone could teach games, and the negative image was often promoted unwittingly by the physical educators themselves when they dealt with a teacher down to cover an absent colleague, and Rachel realised that;

"It doesn't help because when people come over for cover, you obviously make it as easy for them as possible and say, 'Well, have a whistle and just do that', and they probably think that's all you do. Whereas you have given them the best group and the best facility to make it as easy as possible. Or, 'You don't have to get changed', or 'You don't have to do that, just stand there and watch them'. They probably think, 'This is good, this is easy. This is what happens'. They don't realise you have just taken all the 'grots'." 21

Since several teachers within the school were better qualified in certain activities than the physical educators, and since the general impression of the staff was 'anyone can teach it' then claims to the criterion of monopoly were undermined, as were claims for professional expertise.
Rothman (1984) suggests that:

"Professional claims to monopoly and autonomy are substantiated on the basis of expert knowledge. All professions are organized around a comprehensive body of expert knowledge. It is this expertise - a source not available to the public that is probably the most fundamental factor in legitimizing professional prerogatives. Freedom from attempts at external evaluation and control - be it by client, consumer, advocates or civil authorities - is defined on the grounds that lay-persons lack the knowledge to make substantive judgements concerning professional performance." (Rothman, 1984, p185)

As noted previously numerous groups and individuals explicitly or implicitly laid claim to possessing the knowledge necessary to physically educate consumers. Whether these individuals had the requisite training or not, many were in a position where they were perceived by clientelle as possessing 'expert knowledge' and were also able to produce high level performers. At times pupil success within the school was seen almost as an embarrassment for the physical education department, for instance, Darryl Walker in 1984 was selected for the England U15 table-tennis squad, similarly two 6th form girls gained honours at the regional golf finals. As several in the department pointed out, this success had nothing to do with the physical education department, since there was nothing they could teach these pupils in these sports where they lacked any expert knowledge.

At other times it remained difficult to differentiate between what was being taught within the school physical education curriculum and
what was on offer by outside agencies. The girls curriculum in years four and five contained sessions on aerobics, which was a relatively recent introduction stimulated by the 'Jane Fonda' health approach imported from California, and the popularity of such television programme as 'Fame'. Catherine notes that this programme and films such as 'Flashdance' starring Irena Carrerra had created a "boom" of interest in this activity from the girls. Therefore, its introduction to the girls curriculum was a result of pressures outside of the school, and was an activity for which none of the female physical educators had been trained, the model being provided by such 'experts' as Jane Fonda. The following extract from my field diary indicates my feelings after seeing Catherine teach a fourth year aerobics class.

"Saw Catherine take a 4th year aerobics lesson today in the senior hall. The music blaring from the tape recorder was the chart number one for the week. The girls were working very hard and with great intensity, there were no non-participants. All of the girls wore leotards, some of them brightly coloured, and some of them obviously expensive. Also, in evidence were leg warmers, and two girls wore dancing shoes. I was reminded of scenes from the television programme 'Fame' which was shown on Thursday nights and focused on a group of adolescents at the New York School of Performing Arts.

Catherine was out in front of the class giving the lead and was perspiring freely. At one point she turned to me and jokingly said that she felt she was near a 'heart attack'. In essence there was no difference between what was going on in this lesson and what I had witnessed the previous evening when I went with a friend to meet his girlfriend at the 'Movement Studio', a newly opened fitness and dance centre in Big City. On entering, the scene was the same, the only difference was that the women were older, and the leotards were even more expensive and 'flashy', plus the surroundings were more regal, with a sprung beechwood floor and 'wall to wall mirrors'. The teacher from the Movement Studio had 'qualified' by attending a course of five weekends duration at Pineapple Studios in London, and she could easily have swopped places with Catherine with nothing changing.
At the end of the lesson Catherine looked exhausted, as did the girls who had put in a great deal of effort. As the girls were leaving I asked several of them how much their multicoloured leotards cost, and had several priced at twenty pounds, even the less showy ones were over ten pounds. I jokingly questioned them as to their opinion on the school hockey skirts to which there was general agreement that they 'wouldn't be seen dead in them'.

In such a situation 'expert knowledge' is difficult to discern and remains problematic. The physical education staff, therefore, had to construct a definition of themselves as 'expert', and Catherine, Rachel, Simon, and Peter contrasted the ability of the physical education specialist to the non-specialist in being able to 'break down the skills of the game and develop tactics'. For the women in particular this was true and Rachel notes that specialists only in years 1-3 would bring about a dramatic increase in the standard of teaching, "If you stay the same, then why bother training for four years, obviously it will make a difference". She notes;

"I don't think the non-specialist would know how to break skills down), they'd be O.K. about teaching passes like this, but if something goes wrong and there is a fault, they struggle. People in tennis slice the ball all the time in tennis, how do you correct it? They can teach, but perhaps not correct the faults, or know where the fault lies."

The specialist teacher was seen to have the capacity to break down the skills in a wide range of activities, as opposed to the one sport that the non-specialist tended to have expertise in. Simon and Peter also differentiated the two groups in their ability to nurture and spot potential talent to feed the school teams. Simon notes;

"...if the people are willing to push them up and know what they are looking for. I'm not trying to decry the people that help out, because we get on very well with all the people that are non-specialists......It's nice that there are a lot of young ones
coming over because you just say, 'Look, this is what I want', and they'll do it for you........It is a problem without a doubt (not being able to spot the talented), and he'll (Lippy Longton) pick a kid out occasionally and say 'he's big, he runs fast', and all that kind of stuff, but you have got to know what you are looking for."  

Since they saw the ability to spot talent as 'learnable' by non-specialists, Simon and Peter were against the change to specialists only in years 1-3. In contrast Alex laid claims to expertise by advocating a different base as the distinguishing mark of the specialist physical educator, which entailed education as a process and not a product. If it was only about product, that is, the production of physical skills then he felt that essentially there could be no differentiation between specialist and non-specialist. He notes, "Now in P.E. it is not so much the end result, or learning the skill, or learning the rules about it. It's the process that becomes important, just as important as the end result."  

As expert in process there was 'theoretically' a differentiation and a boundary maintained between specialist and non-specialist, whilst on this basis it could be claimed that the non-specialist had been involved in physical education for all the 'wrong reasons', such as, being an able performer in one sport, and as he notes "There is more to P.E. than that." The rationale espoused by Alex based on the social education of the pupil via experiences formed a demarcation line between the specialist and non-specialist, even though he knew that several of his department did not agree with or understand this view. Specialists were seen as essential for the following reasons;
"So the kids get some idea of developing interpersonal relationships within the process, and also going through problem solving. Putting them through certain experiences and being aware of what they are getting through those experiences, and to be aware that you are providing those challenges. Now we've got specialists who don't understand that at the moment, so Christ knows how we are going to get it understood by non-specialists." 31

Alex made his views on the division between the two groups based on educational terms explicit in a letter to the Times Educational Supplement (1984), which was in response to an article on the problems of the non-specialist teacher in physical education. Part of the published letter is as follows;

"Whilst I share Mr. Delamont's sympathy for the non-specialist teacher who is thrust into a subject area that he lacks training and understanding in, my main concern is for the pupils that come into contact with him. The children's attitude towards physical activities and the positive effects in present and future life could be damaged beyond repair." 32

By promoting the specialist as the only one capable of understanding and being able to structure the environment in order to control the vital experiences of children, Alex created a division between the specialist and the non-specialist, which was clearly different in form from the division based upon the 'product' rationale contained within the sporting perspective. Having claimed and promoted this idea within the school Alex seized the chance when it became available to introduce the structural change of specialists only in years 1-3 as part of the removal of half-year games, since this made the point 'obvious' that these were critical years for pupils that were best served by specialist staff only, who
had the 'expert knowledge' (as defined by Alex) to promote a positive attitude to physical activity.

(15.2.3) AUTONOMY.

Rothman (1984) explains that;

"Autonomy refers to freedom from external social control over both the internal affairs of the profession and the individual behaviour of the membership. For the collective it involves the authority to establish, monitor, and enforce its own membership criteria and standards of conduct. Autonomy at the individual level involves the discretion to define the terms, conditions, pace, and content of the work. Autonomy is never without limits, since many external groups have the resources to impose restraints upon any occupational group." (Rothman, 1984, p. 186)

As indicated earlier, the physical educators took it as self-evident that how they taught in the classroom was not open to outside interference, and Hendry (1978a) notes that, "Most head teachers give the physical education staff freedom to organise their own curriculum within the limits of the timetable and certain fixed resources" (p. 45). However, this autonomy need not be based on professional status, but as Bain (1983) points out, it may be more a function of institutional neglect linked to the low or peripheral status of physical education as a school subject. The most obvious constraints on the organization of the curriculum at Branstown School was the manpower made available to the department each year. Concerning the necessity of having to incorporate non-specialists in 1983-1984 to operate the physical education curriculum Alex notes;

"The P.E. department having to deal with non-specialists is a thorn really in the system. The argument that I put forward (at senior planning committee) was that ever since major games were
introduced to the P.E. curriculum, it has always been assumed that anyone who could perform, or had any athletic ability, would be pencilled in for teaching some aspect of P.E. So when it came to the timetable looking for gaps in the P.E. timetable, you could just look around and go look for people who were good performers and approach them to take the lesson. If the Head of P.E. was lucky he might get consulted in that. Then the fact that the person could only perform that activity he likes, for example, rugby, and he couldn’t do any other activity, and that is only taught for half a term. That wasn’t taken into consideration, they put him in because he could play rugby, and assumed that he could do everything else." **34**

Faced with this situation provision had to be made to ensure that the non-specialists were able to at least cope in those areas where they has no expertise, which required a large investment of time and energy by the physical educators. This investment was often not felt to be worthwhile since it was unlikely that the same person would be timetabled with the same groups the next year. This form of ‘random’ allocation was taken to be another indicator of the low status of the subject, as Alex pointed out, “We are just given the scraps after they have been dealt with in their own department, where they fit in is not taken into consideration in P.E." **35**

Concerning the level of consultation involved he notes;

“I get consulted as to who I don’t want. I get given about eighteen or twenty names, and I get consulted as to who I don’t want, but I don’t get consulted as to who I want, which I can bet doesn’t happen in Maths or Physics.” **36**

The proposed new system of physical education specialists only teaching in years 1-3 was seen by Alex to by-pass this reliance on non-specialists (in 1983 this involved 14 staff), which gave back to Alex and his staff the freedom to control their own curriculum in the lower years, and if his long term plan came to fruition then
years 4 and 5 would also be open to more control by the physical education staff. Alex notes in terms of his ability to make decisions concerning the organization of his curriculum under the proposed new system.

"With non-specialists, you are almost being dictated to by the non-specialist or the activity. Or the activity is being controlled by other people, what activities you can teach.....I would argue that this system that we have arrived at so far....maintaining that every kid in the first three years now, every time they come to P.E. they will come into contact with a specialist. So we choose what we want to teach and when we want to teach it in the first three years. And we are not dictated to by the non-specialist teacher or the activity that the non-specialist teacher can offer, whether it be rugby, we don't have to have rugby on at that time when he is on for a year. So I am not being dictated to about what I put in my curriculum and when I put it there." 37

Monica was in a similar position of being constrained by non-specialists, and also had one specialist less than the men. Due to the 'chaotic' history of the womans department before Monica arrived any opportunity to raise the standard of teaching was held back by the presence of the non-specialists, even though the women invested a great deal, of time and energy in providing syllabi of work and individual help for them38. In terms of raising the standards, reducing the stress of the working day, and streamlining the department, all the women were in favour of this change in the structure of the curriculum.

Attempts by Alex to reduce the stress on inter-school fixtures should also be viewed as a strategy to promote subject autonomy. One of the major constraints operating on the old system, that is, the one in operation between 1983-1984, was the timing of county trials
in the major games, the duration of leagues, and the terms that the local schools played a particular sport in. As an example, Simon explained to me that there was a lot of pressure to push rugby and get sides picked by the fourth week of term because this was when the external fixtures against other schools began, similarly the county trials took place in the eighth week of term, and he wanted Branstown School to be represented. The schools in the area played rugby in the autumn term, and football in the spring term which again meant that there were external pressures to have these activities on the curriculum during these specific times.

Alex felt that such a situation was again dictating to him the content of the curriculum, and made it clear that he wished for a reduction of emphasis in this area, which under the new tutor-group system meant that any given activity (within the internal constraints of facilities) could be taught at any time of the year, for example, tennis could be taught in the winter (indoors), and hockey could be taught in the summer. Once again this was an example of Alex attempting to gain autonomy to make decisions concerning the content of the curriculum.

(15.3) SUMMARY.

Various sources of deprofessionalization within the school and beyond the school gates have been indicated, which constantly undermined the central criteria of a profession, that is, monopoly, autonomy and expert knowledge. The structural change by Alex in
which physical education specialists only were to teach in years 1-3, has been interpreted as a reaction to this deprofessionalization in which he utilised the resources at his disposal to reprofessionalize the subject area by creating clear demarcation and boundary lines between specialist and non-specialist teachers, based on a conception of physical education as 'process' not 'product'. The removal of non-specialists in years 1-3 allowed greater freedom for the physical education department to control its own curriculum in these years and in years 4-5, since non-specialists were only used here at this level which made the system more flexible in terms of organising options.

From an original figure of fourteen non-specialists attached to the department in September 1983, under the new system in 1984-1985 there were only seven, who were placed on 4th and 5th year activities only. This system was accepted by the women's department since it eased their organisational problems in the lower years in games lessons, and reduced the time and energy they had to spend promoting competence with non-specialists. However, Simon and Peter remained firmly against such a structural change since they felt it would reduce the commitment of non-specialist staff to assist in producing school teams.

An unintended consequence of this structural change was to strengthen the employment prospects of the physical educators within the school and act against their redeployment. In 1984 falling rolls were becoming a problem at Branstown School and
there were 'rumours' of the possibility of losing their 6th form to a nearby school which had been earmarked as a 6th form college. In September 1985, Branstown School had to reduce its staffing level by six due to these falling rolls, and the department were anxious over the possibility of redeployment. However, as Alex pointed out a "hidden consequence" of this change which he was not aware of when he introduced it, was that it made it very difficult to redeploy his specialists since only they could operate on the curriculum in years 1-3, in addition the two staff who had been appointed to the department in September 1985 had high status second subjects (Maths) which again decreased the likelihood of them being redeployed.

(15.4) NOTES AND AUDIT TRAIL FOR CHAPTER FIFTEEN.

1. See Chapter 13 on Status.
2. Etzioni (1969)
3. Judge (1974) uses medicine and law as examples of this.
4. Toren (1975) does however make it clear that she classifies teaching as a semi-profession within this category.
5. The following have argued to various degrees that deprofessionalization is desirable: Benne (1970), Bennet and Hockenstad (1973), Haug (1973), Halmos (1965, 1970, 1971), and Reiff (1971).
7. The early work within this area is contained within a structural-functional framework. See for instance Barber (1963), Goode (1957), Greenwood (1957), Moore (1970), Parsons (1939), and Pavalko (1971).
9. See Elliot (1972), Johnson (1972), and King (1968).
10. Hughes (1958) claims that 'profession' is a term which is a symbol for a desired conception of one's work and hence is an integral part of the self.
12. See Berlant (1976), Kronus (1976), Larson (1977). Also, Goodson (1983a) gives an excellent example of the struggle for acceptance by Geography as an 'academic' subject.
13. Templin et al (1986) have argued that in North America physical education has undergone deprofessionalization, but includes no evidence of physical educators offering any resistance to this trend within schools.
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CHAPTER SIXTEEN (MICROPOLITICS 3)

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC RHETORIC
(16.1) FOUNDATIONS OF A STRATEGIC RHETORIC.

The structure and function of rhetoric has been studied extensively in industrial disputes and international conflicts', yet little attention has been paid to its development and use as a strategy within the school as a workplace², although Keddie(1971) and Sharp and Green(1975) in considering the split between theory and practice, realised that whilst overt theories may be loosely tied to practice they can also serve important rhetorical functions in particular settings. Within the department at Branstown School, despite the contrasting perspectives contained within, each individual indicated a clear concern for status, career, and professionalism, and the institutional constraints operating in relation to these within the school have been outlined in earlier chapters. Set within the context of these constraints one of the key elements of the innovation to emerge during 1983-1984 was the development of a form of rhetoric which the researcher classified as 'rhetorical justification'³.

This involved the physical educators learning to use a stylised form of language which acted as a self-defensive rhetoric which supported group identity and justified their existence as a professional group, by persuading others that their subject was worthy and deserving of status, and that they themselves were knowledgeable and up-to-date in educational matters. This rhetoric in effect allowed these teachers to create and maintain a dislocation between what was said
in certain social settings within the school where individual and subject status was negotiated, and the actual practices happening in the classroom which centred upon the concerns of control, achievement, autonomy and competence. As Breakwell (1985) pointed out:

"Any message designed to persuade or impress via any medium can be called a rhetoric. The label carries pejorative connotations nowadays. It implies that the message is tinged with insincerity, exaggeration or even barefaced untruth. Yet rhetoric is undoubtedly an important element in any conflict between social groups." (Breakwell, 1985, p22)

Curriculum innovation was located by the physical educators at Branstown School within a rhetorical framework, and Reid (1984) has claimed that the professional act of the teacher lies in activating and maintaining the categorical status of what he/she teaches, and that teachers are not manipulators of reality but purveyors of rhetorics, in which professional ideologies are seen as a means to the successful accomplishment of this role. However, Williams (1985) offers a slightly different conceptualization:

"...does in fact offer the teacher a means of making progress towards change, providing that he uses the potential that exists for manipulating the realities of the educational process through adopting the appropriate rhetorics." (Williams, 1985, p408) (Emphasis added)

Learning to manipulate the selected realities associated with the proposed innovations became essential for those within the department at Branstown School, both in terms of their interaction with each other and the other members of staff. Rhetoric, along with other dimensions of language, such as, 'proximal explanation' were
seen by the researcher to operate within the differing social contexts that the school offered, with rhetorical justification being directed at certain significant publics in order to enhance subject status whilst maintaining teacher autonomy to cope with the concerns of control, achievement, and competence in the classroom, thereby allowing actual practice to be legitimately divorced from the ideal views espoused in the staffroom.

The conception of rhetoric as a strategy within the micropolitical arena of Branstown School clearly draws upon the analytical framework suggested by Hoyle (1982), but also incorporates the work of Reid (1984) and Williams (1985) who themselves have developed the work of Meyer (1978, 1980) to consider the development of English and Physical Education respectively as curriculum subjects. Meyer's (1978, 1980) work can be taken to challenge the implicit assumptions held by many writers concerning the school curriculum, where what is taught is seen to result essentially from decisions and initiatives taken within educational organizations. The individual teacher is taken to be far from autonomous, having to work within external constraints which may limit his/her capacity for decision-making and action.

Specific characteristics of school subjects are identified, such as, universality, centrality, sequential significance and status-relatedness, which may affect their position in the status hierarchy. Subject survival is seen as depending upon the rhetorical ability of
teachers to influence significant 'publics' of their importance. As Reid(1984) notes:

"For while it may appear that professionals have power to determine what is taught (at school, district, or national level, depending on the country in question) their scope is limited by the fact that only those forms and activities which have significance for external publics can, in the long run, survive." (Reid, 1984, p. 68)

Hence, the importance of using appropriate strategies to align the 'organizational categories' (maintained on the whole by teachers) with 'institutional' categories' (which are significant for various 'publics' or "constituencies"). Non-alignment between these two categories can lead to a loss of support from the 'publics' resulting in the alienation of the subject and eventual failure. The development and use of rhetoric at Branstown School indicates how the physical educators attempted to construct such an alignment between the two forms of categories within the institutional constraints of the school as a workplace.

(16.2) RHETORICAL JUSTIFICATION.

Rhetorical justification involves the use in 'everyday' language of concepts borrowed from educational theory, such as, 'developing the whole child', 'negotiated curriculum', 'core experiences', 'individualised learning', 'invasion games', 'games for understanding', 'health related fitness', and 'body management'. Such abstract terms are then linked to the content of the subject which is justified in terms of what it can offer the child in relation to these
educational experiences. The ability to utilise rhetorical justification is a learnt ability dependent upon time and circumstance. Alex had been sensitised to its use in his previous school where his Head of Department had continually asked him to justify his actions, and encouraged him to attend courses where he came into contact with advisors and senior teachers who provided a range of educational perspectives which were articulated in an elaborate language form. His reading as chairman of the Lower School Curriculum Working Party coupled with the demand for justifications in various school committee sessions and from senior staff extended this ability. Of significance, was his meeting with Len Almond in February 1984, where Almond outlined and clarified a 'coherent' (to Alex) rationale for the inclusion of physical education on the curriculum. Alex notes of this meeting;

"It clarified a lot of ideas that I had, that had been going around in my head. It gave my thoughts a little bit more structure. A lot of my thoughts had tied in with his, and things were becoming a lot clearer. You know what it's like when you have been thinking of something, and somebody says it, and you think 'Christ!, that's what I've been trying to say for a long time'. It just gave it more structure. One of the main things that he really clarified for me was the practical aims of physical education.....He came up with the idea that the aim of P.E. is to improve the quality of life." 8

On the return journey from Loughborough University Alex was very enthusiastic over the form, content, and style of the rationale that Almond had proposed, which he saw as a valuable aid in impressing the senior management as to the centrality of his subject, he notes;

"Christ, that's the framework I've been looking for, that puts it all together in a watertight case. If I can put all that together in staff meetings and with the Head then we are home and dry. Everyone in the department will have to get this sorted out in
Their minds, that it's about the quality of life, it will be a new language to some of them."

This meeting not only reinforced the opinion of Alex that his idealist perspective was 'correct', but also extended the vocabulary of the rhetoric which he in turn introduced to his staff, for instance, after this meeting the words 'entitlement curriculum' were used within the department for the first time. Alex was confident in his use of rhetorical justification and felt that by its use he would be able to convince the school hierarchy (a significant public) of the value of his proposed changes and raise the status of physical education within the school, "They (senior teachers) wouldn't know if they were coming or going. I could justify it to them, and I could probably come out of an hours meeting or discussion with them getting them to think 'Yes, it is right'". Indeed, on his meeting with the Headmaster in June 1984 to plead for more scales for his department, it was made clear to Alex that the allocation of these scarce resources was dependent upon his, and by implication his departments, ability to argue and justify their subject to other members of the school senior management in educational terms. Concerning this meeting Alex notes on the advice the Headmaster gave him as to how to obtain more scales points;

"Having done that (put claim for scales and a justification on paper) I must continue to force it not with him, but with other members of the senior management, as well as other senior teachers and heads of departments within the school. To discuss it with them and push it. He said the outcome will depend on (a) how well I put the case over, and (b) how forcefully I put the case over, in how willing I am to keep on coming back and pushing it, which I am willing to do......Informally around the school, but on a formal basis at senior planning. I've got a meeting with Clarke Kent coming up on the 9th, next Monday.....That is to discuss the contribution of our department
to the school...he wants to see where I feel my department is going. He's talking to every department in the school." 9

In this meeting, a key member of the significant public for Alex, had confirmed an appropriate strategy to attain the goal of enhanced status for physical education, which would need to include a rationale in educational terms linking departmental to school aims (aims-alignment strategy), which was to be directed at the school senior management. Alex was aware that his predecessor Boris Green could have attempted this aims-alignment;

"...had he been aware of the educational jargon and everything, or just been aware of the educational aims relating to the school. There's lots of things you can tie in, but it's being able to tie them in and recognise that you can tie them in, and identify them with your department and say 'This is how we are contributing to the whole school." 10

Boris Green's inability to utilise rhetorical justification was linked by Alex to the history of the department and the fact that the Headmaster who appointed Green accepted an elitist ideology and sanctioned winning school teams as the means to attain status. Hence, in such a context the use of rhetorical justification would have been inappropriate, just as with the present Headmaster and current school climate its use was seen by Alex as the only avenue to enhance status. As an example Alex offered his meeting with Clarke Kent (one of the Deputy Heads), which he claims could have been a 'harrowing' experience, but due to his mastery of rhetorical justification Alex was able to note;

"But I had an answer for everything he wanted, and he was coming back with more and more what could have been difficult questions, but because I knew clearly in my mind exactly where
I wanted to go, and how I wanted to do it, and I could justify it in educational terms.\textsuperscript{11}

Unfortunately, in September 1983 Alex was the only one in the department who could utilise rhetorical justification in depth. Monica realised its importance but still found it difficult to justify her subject in educational terms, "I still find it difficult to answer even now. To put into words without just reeling off, sort of jargon that I know. I find it very difficult to put into words what P.E. is about. I could certainly give you the jargon, and I would have had it when I came out of college as well\textsuperscript{12}. Monica found the 'jargon' difficult to master and admits that one of her main aims in attending the curriculum course at Leeds during the Summer of 1983, was to learn the appropriate terminology in order that she could justify her subject in the public arenas of the staffroom and staff meetings\textsuperscript{13}.

"I was on this course quite recently and I felt terrible that I couldn't put into words how I really felt about P.E. All I really felt like saying was, "O.K., I really enjoy it and hope that is going for the kids as well'.........We had at the beginning of the course, one of the first things we had to do, was to say what we hoped to gain from it. One of the things I did say was, 'I hope that I can justify my subject if somebody asks me, that's one of the things I would like to do after the course', I still can't do it....because I haven't really consolidated the information given to me."\textsuperscript{14}

Monica, along with the rest of the department, was acutely aware that despite her practice of teaching in the classroom the essential need was for a language form capable of justifying her subject to other teachers beyond the department in non-classroom settings, where as she put it "you need the answers behind you"\textsuperscript{15}, in terms of
educational terminology and not experiential awareness. The rest of the department came to realise its great importance over the coming years in relation to promoting individual and subject status and advancing their own careers.

In January 1984 Alex claimed that getting his department familiar with and capable of utilising rhetorical justification was to be a central aim of his over the coming months.

"What I want is a department where everybody knows exactly what they have to teach, and why they are teaching it. They are conversant and able to go away and argue and discuss it with other people outside the department from strength, in that they know exactly what they are doing and why, and in what way it contributes to the rest of the curriculum offered in the school, the aims of the school. That to me is my aim at the moment." 16

"I can't see Simon, or anyone else in our department talking to anyone else in the school, and really affecting the prestige of the subject in this school at the moment. I will need to produce an 'educated' P.E. staff who are more aware of what they are doing, why they are doing it, and more able to argue within the whole school situation, within staff meetings and the staffroom." 17

The departmental meetings were the central arena in which Alex introduced his staff to this language form since it formed the content of his own rationale and justification for the curriculum changes he was proposing16. The insistence by Alex that his department also learn to justify their statements in rhetorical terms and his implicit suggestion of its utility in gaining status, was a critical influence on them adopting this language form. As Monica notes on the effects of these demands by Alex in departmental meetings;
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"We decided as a department, it was Alex who got us thinking about it, but we decided that we ought to improve the status of the department in the eyes of the whole school....So we had to become well versed in the changes that were taking place, in case people asked us about it in meetings." 19

By April 1984, Alex felt that several of his department were now approximating a basic use of this language form, "I think that I have got enough people who are thinking, not in my terms, but in what I consider to be the right terms"20. However, by September 1984 he was still unsure as to whether all his department could argue for their subject in the depth required, particularly when subjected to the 'offensive rhetoric' which would be used to challenge them outside the department from other subject teachers, "They will have the idea in their mind, but when questioned, and they have got to modify anything in their mind and come back with a coherent argument, that is the main problem"21.

(16.3) THE USE OF RHETORIC IN MAINTAINING A COHERENT FRONT - THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PERFORMANCE TEAM.

Alex was concerned that all the department should be able to argue a similar case for physical education to other members of staff, and felt that there needed to be some measure of uniformity in the message in order that the rest of the staff would receive the impression of the department as 'together' and unified. The need for a coherent front was seen as essential, and Alex notes;

"It was very very important, otherwise I would have been arguing the case in one way in the staffroom or whatever, and they would have undermined it by not arguing in the same way, that would have put me in a weak position. It would have seemed
that the department were not behind me......We had to present a unified front to make an impact on the rest of the staff, what went on out on the games field is another matter as I'm sure you know." 22

Here, Alex makes it plain that the use of rhetorical justification has as its aim the management of impressions in the educational context of the school, and the 'bad' practice of some of his department (in his eyes) was not included in the content of this rhetoric, since this would serve to fracture the image presented, and so such practices remained hidden from view and glossed over in conversation. In September 1986 Alex was aware that neither Simon or Peter had changed their classroom practice at all, but he felt he had been 'successful' with them in terms of improving their ability to utilise rhetorical justification, which in turn presented a more 'professional image' to the other teachers in the school, which in turn reflected well on the department, the subject, and on Alex as its leader. Concerning their progress and image presentation in 1986 he notes;

"Very professional, much more so than when I arrived, and that's how it's got to be if you want to gain recognition for your subject. That's one of the main arenas of, if you like, being on show (the staffroom). It's where you impress colleagues that you understand educational matters and just don't play sport all day. They are much better now at that, that's very pleasing to me, it strengthens my case, I'm backed up. They weren't doing it before as far as I could gather, not promoting themselves. It's difficult to know what other pressures have affected their behaviour....Pressures of other jobs, like Simon and Peter. Whether they have to talk more about education, or they had to to get the job in the first place, it's a skill they've learnt......They are much more responsible, they present a better image for the department now......It pleases me obviously because it puts the department in a position of strength.....Then it gives more power to what's going on in the department and makes it better for my case when I argue it with senior management, they see it as a reflection of me." 23
The need to construct a performance team was influential in Alex's recruitment policy and Helen, who replaced Catherine in September 1985, was in part chosen for her impressive ability to argue the case at interview for the inclusion of physical education on the curriculum in educational terms, that is, she had mastered the basic form of rhetorical justification, plus she indicated that she would be prepared to translate these ideals into practice. Alex notes, "The way I see her, is as someone who is going to speak to other staff in the school and get the subject over". Similarly, Daniel who replaced Jeremy in September 1985, was seen to have the potential to promote the subject via rhetorical justification, but would need tutoring by Alex in this area, "He says things without thinking, but he is only a young teacher, he will learn how to argue things better as time goes on, and it's part of my job to show him how to do it". To this end Alex had ensured that he had "total control" over these new teachers in terms of their counselling and curriculum so that he would be the dominant force in their socialization as physical educators within Branstown School, an important part of which, in terms of Branstown School was learning to rhetorically justify the subject.

The intention of constructing a performance team was to present a coherent and unified front within the educational context to the rest of the staff, and in particular the school senior management. Bearing in mind the conflicts within the department during 1983-1984, this form of presentation may be seen as a 'facade' created
to achieve the superordinate goal of status enhancement and career advancement whilst concealing intra-departmental conflicts and the private realities of classroom practice. In this sense rhetorical justification operated in a similar fashion to Smith and Kieth’s (1971) ‘formal doctrine’, which they claim is;

"A well codified and an abstract doctrine has a number of dysfunctions. One of them is the cloaking of organizational realities. In this usage we argue that every organization to some degree masks its internal functioning to the public. We hypothesise that the more formalised the doctrine becomes and the more internal problems that exist, the greater the degree of masking that will occur." (Smith and Kieth, 1971, p47)

At Branstown School this cloaking, particularly during 1983-1985, should not be seen as dysfunctional since it was intended to conceal the practices in the classroom which would have undermined claims for status enhancement in terms of both subject and personal gains. Smith and Kieth (1971) also recognised at their own school of Kensington that the day-to-day reality was often not totally congruent with the formal doctrine, leading to the presentation of a special 'public' face, which centred on intentions, 'what we are trying to do', and on special atypical concrete instances that illustrated these intentions. Similarly at Branstown School rhetorical justification was associated with debates over subject paradigm and not subject pedagogy which if mentioned was framed in 'idealised' terms and not 'actualities', and this allowed the maintenance of a theory-practice chasm for several of the teachers to be developed and maintained.
THE SITUATED APPROPRIATENESS OF RHETORICAL JUSTIFICATION

The 'net effect' of Alex's efforts to orientate those within his department towards his own idealist perspective, was that they learnt to utilise rhetorical justification to further the ends of the department, and enhance their own image in the eyes of others. However, simply because the physical educators had learnt to use rhetorical justification, this did not mean that they had come to believe in its content, nor did it necessitate them questioning or changing their own practice of teaching in the classroom. They came to realise its utility in certain selected social encounters where the aim was to present a required image to enhance status, the apparent success of which legitimised rhetorical justification as a strategy. This section focuses on Simon as an example of the situated appropriateness of this coping strategy, since he made it clear that he had no intention of changing his teaching practice, but was prepared to use rhetorical justification to further his career aspirations. Concerning the rhetorical justification used by Alex he notes;

"I don't see anything wrong in what Alex is suggesting whatsoever. I think that it's a good exercise for the department to go through, just to waken up to that perhaps there are some new ideas coming in......It won't change at all (his style of teaching). There may be a few things that I hadn't stopped to consider. When you were at college you had that list of things on why you justified P.E. as a subject, the aesthetic etc (does a smirking action behind hand held over face for the benefit of the interviewer) guffaw, guffaw. Aesthetics was one of them, but it's not very important, it's the same for all of them.......I'd justify it (P.E.) for exactly the same reasons as Alex. I would say exactly the same things, to do with body management, to do with health and fitness, all the little things to do with posture, and everything else, decision making of the individual,
individual working, all the rest of the bullshit. I would say exactly the same thing." 30

The success of Alex in being elected as Chairman of the Lower School Curriculum Working Party was seen by Simon (and the rest of the department) as evidence of the effectiveness of this strategy, and rhetorical justification was conceived as an integral aspect of impression management for career purposes. Based on this he felt that Alex had "done everything right in terms of getting involved in all the right things, in school committees, working parties, this kind of thing, being seen to be an innovator within the department. As far as I can see, comparing him with Boris Green, I don't think that the P.E. department has ever been in a stronger position to argue for points" 31, hence rhetorical justification was seen as essential in creating a public awareness that the individual was 'up-to-date' with recent innovations, and an informed educator, to assist in the battle for scarce resources which included promotion. Simon made it clear that the use of rhetorical justification at interviews could work to his advantage;

"It sounds really waffly, 'games-for-understanding' to me, but I mean people are impressed yes, if you can talk the language, you know the jargon. People 'understand' by that, that you are well read and well versed, and they like some proof of the fact that you are changing." 32

Similar to Hilsum and Start's (1974) teachers, Simon (along with the rest of the department) believed that success as a classroom teacher was not influential in gaining promotion (although they felt it should be), and rhetorical justification was developed and adopted as an appropriate alternative strategy to cope with the prevailing
conditions for gaining promotion. Its use did not necessarily bear any relationship to the private views and intentions of the individual, it became a pragmatic strategy to achieve a goal. Considering the interview situation Simon notes;

Simon: But at the end of the day there is a lot that you can say in interview that you can get away with, that you don't have to do after if you get the job.

Researcher: How do you mean?

Simon: Well, 'Would you be willing to take on a health-related-fitness course?'. 'Oh yes please, I'd love to do that' (laughs). You would say that even if you didn't have a bloody clue, you, would still say it, and say that you could do it......P.E. is full of theory now, as long as you can spout the theory you can get on. The fact that you may be a bloody good teacher means bugger all, or it seems to me that's the way it is, and you spout it all out if you want to get on.

Researcher: Even if you don't agree?

Simon: Of course, whether you agree or not has nothing to do with it, it's giving out all the right bullshit to the right people at the right time, which is so ridiculous when you think of it.

The following extract from my field notes also gives a typical example of the use of rhetorical justification by Simon with (for him) a member of the 'significant public' in the school.

Had lunch with Simon today in the 5th form dining area, as was his custom Simon jokingly persuaded the cooks to give him double portions of chips and beans claiming he needed extra food to maintain his 'athletic physique'. At the cash desk he only paid for single portions. We sat on a table which had two boys on it, Simon immediately struck up a conversation with one of them who was in his 1st fifteen last term, and who was now playing for one of the local colts teams. The subject was the difference in the 'hardness' of the play and how it toughened the player up, it 'sorted the men from the boys'. As the boys left, Larry Locke the Head of Fifth Year sat down next to Simon. During the conversation Larry mentioned to Simon that his youngest daughter had just started doing gymnastics at junior school, and that when she returned home and demonstrated some to him, he felt it looked a bit like dance. Simon explained that
it was probably based on educational gymnastics which he taught
to the boys in the lower years at Branstown. He pointed out
that this form of gymnastics had a great many advantages in
going the child aware of her own body, providing a wide range
of experiences, in which the child could learn at its own pace
on individual open tasks. I casually continued to eat my food
listening intently but trying not to look directly into Simon's
eyes since I did not want to embarrass him since he knew that I
understood his views on educational gymnastics, and what he was
now saying was not his 'true' views as confided to me. At one
point he asked me for the salt and as I passed it to him he
gave a big grin and winked at me. Larry Locke seemed impressed
by Simon's awareness of what his daughter was being initiated
into and commented 'It all sounds very complicated to be putting
a young girl through'. As we were leaving the dining room I
jokingly said to Simon 'You're a con-man', at which he laughed
and said, 'Yes, but you can see what I mean about giving out the
bullshit, that bloke lapped that up, he really did, and he's a
Head of Year for Christ's sake'.

This is but one of many examples of rhetorical justification and its
situated appropriateness. It was called into action in the presence
of significant publics, such as, heads of year, departmental heads,
and the senior management team. It was never used by the physical
educators to each other in informal circumstances, such as, in the
changing rooms or in the coffee area, if by chance it was, then it
was spoken in jest and was the focus of ridicule by the rest of the
department, indicating that these were not the appropriate audiences
or legitimate contexts for its use.

(16.5) LEGITIMISING A RHETORIC AS A PRAGMATIC STRATEGY.

None of the physical educators felt that the use of rhetorical
justification was deceitful, even when they did not agree with its
content, as it was defined in the context of the school as a
workplace as being a legitimate pragmatic strategy for enhancing
status. This legitimisation process took place in relation to significant role models within the school who were seen to have 'got on' in the system by skillful use of this language form, and in this sense it had 'proven' value in the educational context. As Simon noted in 1986 in his capacity as Deputy Head of Year, "You have got to be seen to be doing the right thing in the right place at the right time......I have got to get on with people, I don't have any choice". The form of language utilised by Alex was seen by Simon to assist in his 'getting on with staff' and gaining personal status within the school, it being more effective than the elitist rhetoric that Boris Green expounded in the staffroom when he was Head of Department prior to 1983.

"You learn from watching what goes on around you. You watch people like Alex, he can talk the back legs off anyone. He might think that the other bloke is a right pratt, but he'll get round him and get what he wants done. With the Head he will put on a different face, all curriculum papers and what have you." 37

This situated learning of how to manipulate facets of self in relation to rhetorical justification became crucial after the arrival of Alex, and highlights the specific targeting of its use. It was not used in 'normal' conversation in the changing rooms, departmental coffee area, or with 'in' colleagues, that is, those who the physical educators felt secure with and did not need to impress. Also conspicuous by its absence in rhetorical justification with the men was the use of swear words which were frequent in the 'normal' conversations when the male physical educators were alone together. As Simon points out;
"For example, in the staffroom. The moment that you know a senior member of staff is around, because that's where it starts, they are your major targets, the main ones, I don't have to give a shit what I say to Peter or Lippy. There are various points in the week, and it doesn't have to be too long before you 'read' what they are about, what their pet ideas are....it is the language that is to do with getting new jobs." 39

Besides this observational learning from significant others on how to present aspects of self there was also direct advice from senior staff to aspiring young teachers. Simon recalls the advice given to him by Nigel Gibbs (then Head of 4th year) in 1982;

"He asked me, 'Well, what kind of impression do you think that you give in the school?'.....What he was basically saying was, make sure the right people get the right impression of you if you want to get on, and also be careful who you speak to. Nigel privately will have a laugh and will muck about with anyone, in school he's a completely different person, not completely different, but he is very wary about having a laugh and a joke. I'm the same, it depends on who is around in the staff room. I'll take the piss with Peter over there (the sports hall), but I wouldn't dream of doing that in the staffroom, I'm on show there.....The impression you give in the staffroom is crucial." 39

The behaviour of the physical educators in the staffroom, particularly for the men, varied considerably from their behaviour over in the sports hall. With the 'sporting clique', such as, Lippy Longton and Dave Mason the conversation focused on the sports that they played at the weekend, the dominant one being rugby, and involved in these discussions were jokes about sex, woman, race, plus 'outsiders' like parents, politicians and famous television personalities40. In such company the staffroom appeared to resemble an 'off-stage' region41 providing a place for these teachers to relax during the day away from the 'front line' of classroom teaching42. However, the presence of 'significant publics', such as a
Deputy Headmaster or a Head of Year, redefined the situation from 'off-stage' to 'front stage' calling for the production of a performance to present the image of 'educator', for which rhetorical justification developed as an effective means to achieve this end.

(16.6) THE DEFLECTION OF CHANGES IN PEDAGOGY

The introduction to the department of a stylised form of rhetoric by Alex, in departmental meetings, and in his interactions in the staffroom, allowed several of his staff to distance themselves from its content by passing it off as 'jargon', for use in specific social situations but having no direct relationship to their practice of teaching. Significantly, during 1983-84, Alex's main concern was to bring about a shift in subject paradigm not subject pedagogy (the latter was to be attempted in 1984-85). Although references were made within discussions to practice, the consequences and implications for subject pedagogy relating to any shift in subject paradigms were rarely made explicit, which was in part due to Alex's lack of clarity in this area. He notes;

"Initially, when I started to explain things, I did find it very difficult to put it down into practical terms, and put it down in not a low level of understanding, but to put it down and make it clear, so that they could apply it to their own situation.....it was to them, not trouble, but this was all theoretical." 43

Since the linkage to the practical situation was not made clear the department had only to come to terms with such abstractions as 'games-for-understanding', and 'individual learning styles' at a
rhetorical level, which facilitated a dislocation between paradigm and pedagogy for those involved. Alex became aware that several of his department had learnt the rhetoric but either, did not fully understand it, or were simply not prepared to change their teaching, and used rhetorical justification only to manage impressions, which was acceptable to him in 1983 but not in 1986. Considering Simons possible interview at a local school in 1986 he notes;

"He's got it all hasn't he, he's bloody got it all, he's heard me say it all. He'll have that off pat and just repeat it, what he's heard me say, even though he doesn't believe in it or act upon it......He told me that he would say, 'I believe in mixed-ability, and this is how we do it', and run off all that I talk about....He's a traditionalist disguised as a child-centred teacher for interviews." 44

Alex also notes how both Simon and Peter utilised the rhetorical justification learnt from him to assist in gaining their scale 2 appointments in the school45, whilst he pointed out that Catherine, Rachel, and Jeremy had gained from being involved in a department undergoing changes and learning the rationale associated with it, and this was a great help in them being promoted to scale 2 posts in other schools46. Concerning the form of mock interview he gave each member of the department and its importance for impression management Alex notes in relation to Jeremy's success in gaining promotion in 1985;

"I think that it was crucial at interview, being involved in the changes here had a large bearing on him getting that job. We went through the job description and the interview techniques with him, and the type of questions that would come up and how to deal with them......The justification for a P.E. curriculum, a curriculum structure and content, and how you link the structure and content to your philosophies on teaching, and how you must have continuity....I think that he went away, having gone through that time and time again, with the ideas clear in his head." 47
However, Alex realised that although Jeremy could argue the case for physical education in theoretical terms, he still found it difficult to translate the theory into his practice, but hoped that 'perhaps' this would change over the coming years. Similarly Rachel also had her letter of application written by Alex and was coached by him for interview. Concerning the impression she was then able to create at these mock interviews he notes;

"Straight, said everything that she'd learnt in the department, which was quite funny really because I knew from having seen her and by being around the department that she didn't mean it. I'd put things down for her about how to answer questions in interview, and about structuring a curriculum, individual achievements, self-directed learning and what have you, and to answer things using her own experience.....She came back with all the right stuff, bloody hell I might have appointed her myself she sounded so good (laughs). I feel really frustrated that I have to do it. It is frustrating to have to tell them what to say, and to hear them saying it, and to know that they often don't understand it, or don't believe in it, the conviction isn't there." 48

However, Alex was prepared to give such coaching for interviews and encouraged the use of rhetorical justification in the staffroom where he displayed his own skill in it to his staff. Since he never challenged openly the fact that for several of his staff the content of this justification bore no resemblance to their real views and practice, the dislocation between theory and practice was condoned and rhetorical justification was constantly legitimised as a strategy for use in the educational context of the school only. Keddie(1971) 48 claims that this is the context for the discussion of school politics which draws selectively and consciously on educational theory and research, and "may be called into being by
the presence of an outsider to whom explanations of the department’s activities must be given” (p135). In such social encounters, teachers are called upon to explain and justify departmental policy away from the harsh realities of the classroom.

In contrast, Keddie (1971) points out that the teacher, or classroom, context involves the world of is rather than ought, a pragmatic world focused upon deeds not words, practice not theory. This is the world in which teachers spend most of their time and according to Andy Hargreaves (1981) it is fundamentally organised around the “principles of habitual and pragmatically based common sense thought and action” (p303). Hence, this is not the context for the discussion of the grand ideals contained in rhetorical justification since it has little significance in terms of coping or survival, and other more appropriate strategies are developed to meet the demands of situation and self in the teaching context.

(16.7) PROXIMAL EXPLANATION AND THE TEACHER CONTEXT.

At Branstown School as the phenomenological frame moved away from the educational context into the routinised world of 'doing the job', then the priorities in terms of the teachers' systems of relevance changed, and with it the form and content of the language used. In the teacher context proximal explanation predominates, and is characterised by the emergent concerns discussed in earlier chapters, which are not expressed explicitly in departmental
meetings or with significant publics in the staffroom which calls for rhetorical justification to be put into operation.

As a contrast the content of rhetorical justification may be compared to the proximal explanations offered by Simon concerning his opposition to the abolition of the half-year games structure. The latter indicated that he preferred this structure since it allowed him to work with a 'top group' of very able rugby players who made up the nucleus of the school team. The production of successful school teams was important to him because he saw it as enhancing the reputation of the school, the department, and himself in a manner that was highly visible and accountable. Simon 'enjoyed' working with elite pupils because it enabled him to get more 'work' done in a lesson, waste less time, and created fewer discipline problems, plus these pupils provided a great deal of positive feedback for Simon with their enthusiasm. Changing to a tutor-group system would undermine this system since lessons would now be mixed ability, thereby reducing the chances of producing winning school teams, since the elite pupil would not be catered for and channelled in the right direction. Mixed ability lessons were seen as problematic in terms of discipline and getting any 'real' work done in relation to the production of visible skilled performance, thereby challenging Simon's conception of himself as 'good' teacher.

The central point to be made is that proximal explanation was not offered to senior teachers or Alex, as this aspect of self was not deemed appropriate for display to these significant publics.
Proximal explanation was rooted in the teacher or classroom context, and its dislocation from the educational context in part explains the ability of several of the teachers in the department to maintain their classroom practice whilst utilising rhetorical justification in alternative social settings. It was the gap between Deutscher's (1973) 'words' and 'deeds' where both are situated in the ongoing interaction in which they arise, each with different levels of appropriateness.

(16.8) SUMMARY.

The pragmatic coping strategy of rhetorical justification developed and utilised by the physical educators at Branstown School may be seen to lend empirical support to the works of Meyer (1978, 1980), Reid (1984), and Williams (1985), who suggest that subject survival is dependent upon the rhetorical ability of teachers to influence significant publics of their importance by manipulating the realities of the educational process. Whilst these writers have highlighted the influence of macro-level factors which provide the structural context within which action at other levels occurs, placing the school as a medium of mediation between structural constraints and classroom contexts, their analytical framework pays little attention to the school institution as a work place. This imbalance has in part been rectified by the preceding consideration of the use of language between staff within the school situation, which reinforces the view of Denscombe (1980) who points out;
"The practical activity of teachers does not exist in a vacuum. The strategies employed by teachers arise in the context of the school organisation which provides the prevailing circumstances taken into account by teachers in their routine activities. The school organisation provides dilemmas and imperatives, possibilities and opportunities, and it is these which explain the existence of particular strategies in the classroom." (Denscombe, 1980, p. 290)

Similarly, the activities of teachers in the educational context also do not take place in a vacuum, but are located within the social context of the individual school as a work place, with its own particular 'institutional bias' providing dilemmas, opportunities and possibilities, within which the teacher constructs, modifies and abandons coping strategies. An essential element of this social context as Branstown School was that of intense competition and conflict, within and between, departments for scarce resources (including status) which was intensified by the curriculum review in 1983-1984, since this 'forced' the debate into the educational context. Such conflict should not be taken to be an unusual state of affairs since as Burke (1969) realises, "conspiracy is as natural as breathing" (p. 166), whilst Gronn (1986) notes;

"Political exchanges, which can occur at all organizational levels and spheres of management, formal and informal, compromise negotiations over definitions governing the content and conduct of action........The norm of schools is conflict. There are always different definitions of the situation in the minds of actors, across the span of managerial responsibility." (Gronn, 1986, p. 45)

The arrival of Alex in 1983 allowed for the development of a coping strategy within such a conflictual environment which was more elaborate in form than that which was previously available to the department, under the previous Head of Department Boris Green. The
adoption of a strategic rhetoric in the form of rhetorical justification not only allowed the physical educators to cope with demands and pressures in the staffroom, it also allowed them to cope with the pressures that Alex exerted upon them to present a more 'educational front' to the school senior management, and to himself, plus justify the existence of their own particular 'favourite' activites on the curriculum at departmental meetings.

The adoption of a rhetoric by his staff early on allowed Alex to cope with those pressures upon him to create change in the department without denying teacher autonomy, and avoiding overt conflict by attempting to shift teacher pedagogy. Hence, the physical educators utilised a rhetoric for its pragmatic value in dealing with other teachers, their own Head of Department, and each other, to achieve status gains whilst allowing their classroom practice to remain unquestioned and unchanged.

With regards to their use of rhetorical justification with Alex, this can be seen to form part of a strategic compliance strategy in which the teachers went along with the way that Alex was managing the department, but held and maintained their own personal views on both teacher paradigm and pedagogy, whilst at the same time maximising potential gains in personal interest areas. In these terms the use of rhetoric is clearly a conscious attempt to create a facade, as Ball(1979) notes;

"Sociologically, a rhetoric may be considered a vocabulary of specific purpose; that is to say, as a limited set of symbols functioning to communicate a particular set of meanings,
directed and organised toward the representation of a specific image or impression. It is conceivable that individual actors, groups or establishments will utilise a rhetoric without any ideological conviction as regards its validity, but with a recognition of its pragmatic efficacy." (Ball, 1979, pp202-203)

The use of rhetoric formed part of the teachers' stock of recipe knowledge before Alex's arrival, its form and content, however, were significantly shaped by him from September 1983 onwards. Their emergent use of rhetorical justification indicates a linkage point between the competing perspectives in operation regarding the changes, in which the rhetoric displays not a totality but a fragment of an entire system of beliefs which becomes operational in the justificatory enterprise. At this level Alex was able to mould these fragments to form a performance team able to impress the specific audiences addressed, by building upon the situated concerns, readiness and capabilities of his staff. As Breakwell (1985) has noted:

"Rhetoric rarely springs full grown from a single mouth; it develops as a product of a community in interaction. Even when its final exposition comes from one person who fits the jigsaw together, the production is only the culmination of a process of social evolution. Were the members of the movement not ready for it, the individual expositor would have no impact. Were the expositor not embedded in the community, the rhetoric would not be tuned to the ear of that community." (Breakwell, 1985, p23)

Hence, Alex built on the awareness already present in the department to elaborate and sanction the use of a strategic rhetoric, which in the first instance, during 1983-1984, was aimed at enhancing subject status. The physical educators based on their own recipe knowledge of the situated use of language in the various social contexts of the school, adopted this rhetoric not only for departmental
purposes, but for their own personal use in terms of enhancing their own individual status within the school and allowing their classroom practices to remain intact. The latter was an unforeseen consequence by Alex which negated him producing changes at the classroom level to any great extent for several of those holding the sporting perspective.
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CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

REFLECTIONS AND SPECULATIONS ON A STUDY
17.1 THE STRANDS OF SELF IN INNOVATION.

"Over the past decade and more, the majority of ethnographic writing on education has largely concerned itself with classroom matters. In contrast the educational rhetoric and professional claims of teachers have, in effect, been relegated to the status of interesting yet briefly surveyed background material against which detailed documentation of teachers' typifications and the like have been compared. One result of this strong classroom orientation in educational ethnography is that our knowledge and understanding of how teachers relate to and interact with their colleagues, and with what consequences, is somewhat scant." (Hargreaves, A. 1984, p244)

Similarly, Ball (1985) notes that few studies have dealt with the conflicts that can occur within departments and schools in relation to change. The focus in the Branstown Study on the pre-implementation or adoption phase of innovation has dealt exclusively with the emergent concerns of the teachers involved, and highlights the conflicts that can occur when competing definitions of subject paradigm and subject pedagogy are mobilised as change disturbs their taken for granted world. In resolving conflict, the form and content of interaction between the physical educators, and between them and other members of staff has been given central importance throughout this study. The evidence presented suggests that it is inappropriate to view the occupational culture of teachers as homogenous, containing a relatively consistent set of beliefs, orientations and practices which transcend the many contingencies and demands of the different settings in which teachers have to operate.
The concentration on the physical educators specifically (to the exclusion of all others) at Branstown School, and their operations in different settings, has allowed revealing insights into the contextual variability of teacher conduct and the sources and influences on such variation. This variability is in part a function of the structural looseness of the school, and the conditions that prevail in the school as a place of work, which teachers must learn to accommodate and manipulate as a central aspect of their 'competent membership' that involves the ability to control self-representations. As Denscombe (1980) notes;

"Competence resides in action not status......To this end there is a need for a description of the work situation, member's activity and their accounts of the dilemmas, imperatives and possibilities they encounter. Some ethnography of the work situation becomes essential. Secondly, organizational activity is viewed as the product of a particular mode of understanding which characterises the competent member. It is how (competent) members interpret situations, how they use the rules, bend, neglect or invoke the official prescriptions themselves and this directs research towards teachers' understanding of the activities in which they engage, and is concerned with intentionality rather than observable indices of behaviour." (Denscombe, 1980, p283)

Such manipulation at Branstown School was seen to be intimately linked to expressions of self, and the initiation of the innovations by Alex related to his conception of self within an 'idealistic' perspective, whilst his proposals for change constituted a threat (as expressed in the emergent concerns) to aspects of self for the members of his department operating initially within the 'sporting perspective'. The expression of the teacher's self emerged as central to the innovation in the curriculum, and Ball (1981a) realises that an adequate account of innovation in or constraints upon teaching
must in some way recognise the implications of and for the
development and sustenance of the self. This is critical since in
the everyday lifeworld of the school it is the teacher's sense of
self and work identity which underpins the meanings and
interpretations attributed to educational phenomenon and work
problems.

It is perhaps at the level of proximal explanation, as revealed in
the confidential interviews that the self is most clearly evident as
an influence on how the teacher negotiates his/her routine world of
work. Building upon the works of other symbolic interactionists Woods (1984) considers the extent to which a teacher finds self
expression within the curriculum, and how far the 'subject' as
practiced in the classroom is a realisation of the individual
teacher's self. He proposes that the self interacts with the
prevailing social circumstances, sometimes borrowing from them, at
other times contributing, and it is this dialectical interplay which
prevails between teachers and subject specialisms. Therefore, just as
teachers 'make' rather than 'take' roles, so they make the
curriculum.

"...a curriculum is a vibrant, human process lived out in the
rough and tumble, give and take, joys and despairs, plots and
counter-plots of a teacher's life. It is not simply a body of
knowledge or a set of skills; nor simply a result of group
activity (Goodson,1983b)....to some extent at least, individuals
can and do chart their own courses, and can engage with the
curriculum at deep personal level." (Woods,1984,p260)

The men's concern relating to the imposition of educational
gymnastics and the removal of the top-group situation at Branstown
School illustrates such a form of engagement, where certain aspects of self were threatened, particularly in terms of control, competence, achievement, and status. In a similar fashion, the general concern for control in changing structural conditions reveals the possible threat to teacher self from pupils in class. For the teachers in the department certain facets of self were activated in the various contexts that the school as a work place provided, and the development of rhetorical justification displays a particular self mobilised as a pragmatic strategy to cope with concerns over status and the need to deflect pressures exerted by Alex for change by maintaining the autonomy of the classroom, that is, this rhetoric minimised the threat to an experienced self in class whilst maintaining favourable impressions in other areas of the school. As Woods (1983) notes;

"People are concerned with developing, projecting and safeguarding a desired image of self. But selves are not unilinear or unidimensional. That is to say that people may choose to project different images of self in different contexts." (Woods, 1983, p14)

Similarly, Stryker (1980) and Thoits (1983, 1986) suggest that the self is composed of multiple identities that are arranged in a hierarchy of salience or importance, and that behavioural choices are a function of the positions of identities in the hierarchy. Since the location of an identity in a person’s salience hierarchy affects its “threshold” for being invoked, the probability of behaviour occurring is related to the salience of the identity or identities relevant to that behaviour. Hence, the self is multifaceted and different facets may find expression in the various social contexts.
available in the school. This is not, however, to imply that the self is totally fragmented, and Ball (1979) differentiates between the 'situated self' and the 'substantial self'. The former are situated in time and space, and are given meaning by the contextualised location, whilst the latter is defined by Douglas (1967) as;

"A general, implicit, non-theoretical assumption made in everyday communications (with oneself and with others) that each individual has, or is, a substance. This substantialist meaning of persons leads to judgement of persons as wholes.......independent of time, place, and situation." (Douglas, 1967, p282)

Therefore, individuals are assigned a substantial identity, against which situated identities play, and reinforce or alter, just as do self image and self conceptions. In terms of the Branstown Study the interviews gained not only access to the substantive self but indicated the manner in which the situated selves were expressed and presented in the social contexts of the school, and in this sense observations were able to locate the situatedness of certain aspects of self. Importantly, the interviews revealed features of the 'private' self, as opposed to the 'public' self on display in the school. The private self consists of the teachers own feelings, attitudes, covert thoughts, along with other aspects that are hidden from (some) others, whilst the public self is the observed self that is subject to public scrutiny by other teachers, and contains those elements of self that are most relevant to motives involving self-presentation and self-portrayal.
The private selves that the researcher gained access to at Branstown School were certainly never made public to the Headmaster or school hierarchy, yet aspects of public self contained within, and presented by, rhetorical justification were, and these aspects of self were in fact specifically constructed and directed at these significant audiences in the school. It is in the construction of coping strategies that threats to self are deflected and contained, and assist in understanding the nature of coping with 'apparent' innovation which need not include changes in practice at the classroom level.

(17.2) COPING WITH AN INNOVATION.

The essential linkage between the private and public self at Branstown School was made evident in its articulation within the pragmatic coping strategy of rhetorical justification. Pollard (1982) in the most developed model of coping strategies to date, claims that in differing contexts teachers will seek to realise their own self conceptions by acting and presenting themselves in ways which are most favourable to their perceived interests and coping needs. Hence, certain facets of self become prominent at different times depending upon the "processual ebb and flow of coping necessities" (p,30), and rhetorical justification may be taken as an empirical example of a coping strategy which is the product of constructive and creative activity on the part of the physical educators in the department. As Andy Hargreaves (1978a) notes;
"The essence of a model organised around the concept of coping strategy is that all actors whether working-class or middle-class, pupil or teacher, act meaningfully and creatively in response to their experienced world. In one very important sense, therefore, as Antonio Gramsci recognised, we are all intellectuals." (Hargreaves, 1978a, p77).

In addition rhetorical justification was not only constructive but adaptive, it being a creatively articulated solution to the recurring daily problems of work, such as, low status and the need to maintain classroom practices with which the teacher felt confident and secure. These problems were highlighted by the school curriculum review and the prevailing institutional bias into which Alex arrived and added to with his calls for change. One major problem was the possibility of changes in teacher pedagogy which were threatened by the structural changes in the curriculum, and this was 'answered' by creating and legitimising a dislocation between the educational and classroom contexts, in which differing aspects of self and differing interests-at-hand were in operation.

It is by following Pollard (1982) in his utilisation of Schutz's (1970) conception of interests-at-hand that the multifaceted nature of self and its expression in various interests-at-hand within Branstown School may help to understand the apparent divorcing of subject paradigm and pedagogy in relation to the innovation where both were located in different contexts containing different interests-at-hand. Schutz (1967) notes that at any given time, "there is such a selection of things and aspects of things relevant to me at any given moment, whereas other things and other aspects are for the time being of no concern to me or even out of view" (p77). This is
linked to motivational relevance which is governed by the teacher's interests prevailing at a particular time and in a particular situation.

"...motivational relevance is governed by a person's interest prevailing at a particular time and in a particular situation. Accordingly, he singles out the elements present in the situation which serve to define the situation for him in the light of his purposes on hand. This motivational relevance is imposed in so far as he has to pay attention to certain situational elements in order to come to terms with them; or it springs from the spontaneity of his volitional life." (Wagner, 1970, p22)

An important distinction needs to be made between 'social interests' and 'interest-at-hand'. The former are interests deriving from structures such as social class positions, whilst the latter are contextually specific interests which impinge on the immediacy of the micro-interactive processes. These may be taken to intertwine, and as members of the occupational group 'physical educators', the self is located within specific structural and cultural locations, within which interests-at-hand become articulated in part, as a result of the recognition of constraints and dilemmas (concerns) impinging upon the teachers in micro-contexts. However, the articulation of interests-at-hand at Branstown School not only reflects, but is a product of the particular self conceptions and self presentations which the innovation threatened, such as, 'good' teachers 'control', 'achieve', and are 'competent' etc. This is to say that the 'threat' of innovation to particular 'selves' which have to be defended, may have their macro referents, but these are realised within the interaction processes contained in the school at the
micro level where teachers' interests prevail at certain times and in certain situations.

In the immediacy of the classroom the interests-at-hand of the physical educators centred around control, competence, autonomy, and achievement. As the phenomenological frame changed to the staffroom, meetings with senior teachers, and interviews, so the interests-at-hand change significantly. In this context status enhancement for both self and subject gain prominence, and rhetorical justification is developed as a strategy to present the particular self as 'informed educator', who is a member of a 'strong' department. Departmental meetings bring about another shift in which alternative aspects of self are activated, and are often highlighted in this context by competing perspectives which gives rise to resistance and conflict as individuals defend self interests by manipulating the decision making processes. The apparent lack of change in the pedagogy of several of the physical educators is a clear indication of the ease with which certain aspects of self and prevailing self interests may become dislocated and bracketed within the social contexts available in the school.

The presentation of different selves within the department and school may be taken as an example of teacher's 'juggling' their self interests in the interaction process so that each individual achieves a satisfactory balance of self interests overall, and rhetorical justification is a coping strategy to maximise this ability. In considering the interests-at-hand of the physical
educators the concern is for the complex set of dispositions embracing goals, values, desires, expectations, and other orientations and inclinations, that lead a person to act in one direction rather than another. As Figure 4 indicates, the main interests of these teachers may be located in a spatial context, and perceived threats to any of these areas of interest will influence the teacher to defend his/her position within the three interconnected domains relating to organisational task (job), career, and personal life (extramural).

**FIGURE 4. ORGANIZATIONAL INTERESTS: TASK, CAREER, AND EXTRAMURAL.**

A representation of the relationship and tensions that can exist between the teacher's job (task), career aspirations, and personal values and life style (extramural interests). The three domains can interact (shaded areas) and also remain separate. The teacher attempts to balance these within the school as an organization, but the balance is uneasy and ever-changing, creating the tensions that lie at the centre of micropolitical activity.

(Adapted from Morgan, 1986)
Task interests are connected with the work the teacher has to perform, such as controlling children, maintaining achievement levels, organising kit, working with other subject specialists and senior teachers. However, life involves more than just doing one's job as the emergent concerns made evident in the study clearly indicates. The teachers brought to the school as a workplace many aspirations and visions as to what their future may (and hopefully would) hold, which provided the basis for career interests which could be pursued within school. There may be an independent task to be performed, but the evidence that has been presented suggests that the conceptions of task were often intimately linked to career, with the educational context being defined as more central to career achievement and advancement than the classroom context. Importantly, being defined as a 'bad' classroom teacher (as Rachel was) does not prevent advancement on the promotion ladder, since the arena for this form of negotiation is the educational context of the school where individual interests merge to influence action, hence 'promoting' Rachel out of the department and the school was in part linked to Alex's own career aspirations which depended on 'producing' a cohesive 'idealist' department.

Finally, the teachers brought to the school their personalities, private values, attitudes, preferences, beliefs and sets of commitments from outside of school life, and these extramural interests helped shape their orientation to task and career
interests. As an example, Simon with the impending birth of his first child significantly reduced his commitment to task and career, yet early on in his teaching life he had devoted so much time to task and career that his marriage (extramural interest) ended in divorce. This is a poignant example of the difficulties inherent in balancing interests in the three domains. Similarly, Peter, in terms of his early conflicts in the school with the old Headmaster and Bill Rogers found himself in a situation of a spoiled career, and therefore reduced his commitment to task and channelled his energies into extramural activities, such as basketball officiating (this could form a potential career). With the arrival of Alex and a reduction in conflict, Peter's commitment to task and career have now increased within the school. For Monica, her domains of interest were significantly influenced by her husbands, and his career development had a direct affect on her decisions to resign from Branstown School and her first school. The influence of parents, husbands/wives, and girlfriends/boyfriends has been overlooked in the present study but future studies will need to include these within a naturalistic framework in order to gain a more complete coverage of the influences on innovations as they are developed in schools.

As Figure 4 indicates the three domains of interest can interact closely yet also remain separate. The problem for the teacher is in striking a balance that is personally satisfying in terms of the three forms of interests. Maintaining this balance is difficult and ever-changing, creating tensions that lie at the heart of the
micropolitical activities (reprofessionalisation, rhetorical justification, resistance, domination) that ensued once Alex had arrived and 'decided' to introduce curriculum innovations. For Alex, the initial inability to perform in the task domain to his satisfaction directly affected his home life, and also had implications for his career development to a scale 4, and on to the advisory service (hopefully). Innovation to him allowed for a balancing of self interests, yet these changes constituted a direct threat to the self interests of several of his department in terms of task (Simon and Peter in particular), whilst for others (Catherine and Jeremy in particular) it allowed them to achieve more balance by facilitating career aspirations.

The emergent strategies, and rhetorical justification in particular, functioned to preserve the individuals balance of interests by protecting self in the classroom (with little or no change in practice) whilst allowing career orientated impression management elsewhere in the school. The arrival of Alex was a significant disturbance to the departments lived in world and as such created tensions and threats which had implications for the mobilisation of individual and group interests. As Morgan (1986) notes;

"By simply following one's personal inclinations one shapes the drama of organizational life in accordance with a political script. However, the political content increases manyfold when we begin to recognise the existence of other players, each with interest-based agendas to pursue. The politicking to which this gives rise becomes particularly visible in situations that present choices between different avenues for future development, and in other transitional contexts such as the influx of new people or the succession of one person by another." (Morgan, 1986, p151)
In this sense the use of rhetorical justification at Branstown School was a strategy developed to maximise self interests in the three domains considered, and this strategy once constructed became legitimised and institutionalised as a strategy for status enhancement during the study. As Pollard(1982) notes:

"To the extent that such juggling becomes patterned and routine or draws on cultural recipes and knowledge it will become institutionalised in the form of coping strategies, and thus begin to form part of the shared 'technology' of teaching in that school." (Pollard,1982,p35).

17.3 INNOVATION AND THE CENTRALITY OF MICROPOLITICS.

The question remains as to the political intent of the physical educators in their juggling of interests and their expression in coping strategies, which focuses on the domain of micropolitics, where according to Hoyle(1982) 'interests' should form the main content. He admits, however, that due to conceptual and methodological difficulties the majority of studies that have addressed themselves to the micropolitical have considered predominantly strategies rather than interests, yet both are taken to be inextricably linked as one creates the other, and is itself maintained by it over time. According to Smith(1983) the use of rhetorical justification may be viewed on a continuum of political behaviours ranging from 'weak' to 'strong'. As a coping strategy within the educational context it enabled in Goffman's(1959) terms, a 'performance' to take place, with the intention of 'managing the
impression' others have of the teacher and his/her subject area by influencing the 'others' definition of the situation.

Hall(1977) proposes that above all Goffman(1959) emphasises civility, whereby the various 'masks' and 'fronts' that individuals put on are functional in allowing individuals to establish their identity at their own pace, as well as being a defence mechanism in uncertain situations. Goffman's(1972) conceptualisation of 'role distance' may be taken as an example of his support for tact and circumspection, in which the function of disguise is not to deceive, but is rather a means of revealing only as much as can be tolerated in interaction. Therefore, impression management in this sense is simply a means of maintaining interaction by the physical educators, and not a deliberate attempt to exploit others, and so may be located as a 'weak' form of political behaviour.

However, Goffman(1968) raises two critical issues with regards to impression management. Firstly, individuals have the right to control the type of information about themselves, and secondly, the right of choice as to the audience that will receive the selected information. Significantly at Branstown School the physical educators directed rhetorical justification at 'target' members of certain significant publics, and this rhetoric contained only selected information about the teacher's self and practices in such encounters. This form of coping strategy may be seen as an attempt to control self-relevant information, which has implications for how the teachers should behave, and how they are or should be defined,
regarded and treated by others in the school. It is generally agreed that when individuals are in the presence of others it is usually in their best interests to convey particular types of identity images. Some projected images will be appropriate to the situation and make the desired impression on others, resulting in the desired reactions from others. Conversely, some images are inappropriate, making undesired impressions and invoking undesirable reactions. The use of rhetorical justification then acts to maximise the reward-cost ratio, of both tangible and intangible outcomes, within the educational context of the school, and necessitates some form of direct control over the self image presented to others.

At Branstown School part of the 'competent membership' of being a physical educator included this ability to control self image presentation, and Alex along with other significant 'reference groups' within the school legitimised and reinforced this central aspect of rhetorical justification which was learnt and developed to cope with specific situations. This self representation is a direct attempt to control self-relevant information before real or 'imagined' audiences', and is, therefore, an intentional goal directed act on the part of the teacher, whose immediate goal is to construct and maintain desired images of self to serve both long and short term interests. Hence, Simon admits to liking the image of 'hard man' in front of the pupils but wishes to appear to senior staff as 'informed educator'. There are potentially many presentations available in the school and these have to be skilfully
matched with particular audience reactions so that the individual's immediate interest-at-hand are satisfied in specific situations.\(^2\)

The type of impressions the physical educators wished to make depended in part on their goals in a given situation, and the strategic forms of self disclosure inherent in rhetorical justification assisted greatly in the impression management related to the innovation serving three main functions. Firstly, it controlled the level of trust and intimacy in the relationship, secondly, it influenced the amount that 'other' learns about the teacher, and thirdly, it effects the relative power of the relationship. As Simmel(1964) notes, "obviously, all relations which people have to one another are based on their knowing something about the other"(p.307). Therefore, by controlling the information available the individual gains greater control in the interaction, and Dawe(1973) in considering the basic principles of impression management claims they are based on concealment, calculation, and gamesmanship. If this is the case, and it would appear to be so at Branstown School, then the use of rhetorical justification along with attempts to reprofessionalise the subject may be located at the 'strong' end of the political continuum, which implies a conscious deception in the hope of maximising gain, and as such has machiavellian overtones.

As Christie and Geis(1968,1970) point out, machiavellians are adept at resisting the influence of others, at least when it is to their advantage, and are skilled at finding ways to circumvent complying
with another’s requests and persuasions, whilst they tend to excel in face-to-face situations where they are permitted some latitude in the type of behaviours they use. The isolation of the closed classroom and the structural looseness of Branstown School meant that there was little chance of performances in the educational context being 'exposed' by comparing them to actual behaviours in the classroom, and as such presented ideal circumstances for such manipulations to take place in. It may well be that the physical educators felt deception to be a legitimate tactic in their struggle for subject and self status within the school, and rhetorical justification was often used with the specific intention to mislead others. Smith (1983) claims that in his experience teachers score low on machiavellian tests, and claim to deplore such tactics, however, in a contracting educational system with increased competition for time and resources he realises that:

"Many [teachers] may be forced by their situation into adopting machiavellian tactics to secure ends either for themselves or their departments. In particular, those in low status areas, or in roles considered peripheral to mainstream activities, may find that they have no alternative but to play their cards close or to form informal coalitions to protect themselves. Any role or situation which creates high threat for people ensures that those people will tend to act in a less open, more devious way." (Smith, 1983, p.207)

Andy Hargreaves (1981) suggests that due to recent changes in patterns of curriculum innovation the educational context of the school is gaining prominence in the life of the teacher, and is "moving in from the periphery of the teacher’s world" (p.304). Often for the physical educators the educational context and the strategies associated with it became the ‘paramount reality’.
whilst at other times it receded into the background lacking any major significance. Such shifts in meaning were coped with by the development of the micropolitical strategies that have been outlined, which also served to maximise self interests as the teachers learnt to operate more skilfully in the contested political arena of the school.

(17.4) THE INFLUENCE OF AN EVOLVING TEACHER CULTURE ON RESPONSES TO INNOVATION14.

It is important to note that the emergent concerns identified at Branstown School, and the resulting strategies were not experienced or developed in isolation. They arose, were interpreted, and articulated within a culture of teachers. Past experiences and present actions of physical educators, and other teachers, both within the school and beyond the school acted as major 'reference groups'5, particularly in terms of 'how-to-get-on' in the school system. Hammersley(1980) notes how teacher dilemmas and conflicts are resolved by recourse to the knowledge of contextually appropriate behaviour, which is both constructed and validated within the social world of the school. This 'technology' of teachers' practices is;

".....a socio-historical product in large part 'inherited' by new teachers and to a considerable extent already tailored to the circumstances in which teachers typically work. It is composed of a set of central concerns and a repertoire of accounting procedures, typifications of situations and lines of action. For reasons...relating to the multi-dimensionality, simultaneity, and unpredicatability of classroom events, much of teachers' classroom action is routinised; involving subconscious, relatively automatic categorisation of events and selection of
The strategies developed by the physical educators made use of the cultural resources already available within the school, and this calls for the development of a concept of culture which is not restrictive but expansive. Hence, in terms of integrating a cultural interpretation of innovation at Branstown School, cultural 'values' are not seen as dominating action in the cultural tradition of Parsons (1951) who suggests that culture affects human action via values that direct it to some ends rather than others, that is, culture is taken to shape action by defining what it is that people want. An alternative view is proposed for the culture of which the physical educators were a part at Branstown School, which following Swindler (1986) is conceptualised as a 'tool kit' of symbols, stories, rituals and world views, which the teachers use in varying configurations to solve different kinds of problem. The 'causal' influence of culture can then be analysed in terms of 'strategies of action' which are persistent ways of ordering action through time, and culture's causal influence can be seen to come not from defining the ends of action, but in providing the cultural components that are used to construct strategies of action. Therefore, action and values are themselves organised to take advantage of cultural competencies.

As Hannerz (1969) points out, people may share many common aspirations, yet remain profoundly different in the way that their culture organises their overall patterns of behaviour. At Branstown
School the quest for enhanced status had been organised in a significantly different manner before the arrival of Alex, when it shifted from an 'elitist' to an 'educational' strategy. Culture in this sense is more like a set of skills and habits which provides certain cultural equipment for producing lines of action. As Swindler (1986) notes:

"A culture is not a unified system that pushes action in a consistent direction. Rather, it is more like a 'tool kit' or repertoire (Hannerz, 1969, p.186-188) from which actors select differing pieces for constructing lines of action. Both individuals and groups know how to do different kinds of things in different circumstances (see, for example Gilbert and Mulkay, 1984). People may have in readiness cultural capacities they rarely employ; and all people know more culture than they use." (Swindler, 1986, p.277)

In line with the humanistic conceptions of man adopted in the Branstown Study, such a view of culture does not accept the view of people as 'cultural dopes', but takes individuals to be active and skilful users of culture, as the construction of rhetorical justification indicates. In as much as the physical educators were skilled users of their own culture, this may in part explain the resistance of several of the teachers to changes in classroom practice, since in this context they had come to value ends for which their particular 'sporting perspectives' equipment was well suited. Change at this level would require drastic and costly retooling in terms of the cultural meanings and social skills necessary to operate within an 'idealistic' frame of teaching at the classroom level. Within the educational context the basis for competence was in existence before Alex's arrival and his promotion of rhetorical justification was generated from this existing cultural
resource, which was less costly and drastic for the teachers involved to learn, modify, and use to their advantage.

The arrival of Alex as 'stranger' began a period of social transformation which may be likened to a phase of 'unsettled lives' for those in the department, in which competing perspectives (idealist v sporting) came into conflict. In such periods several have noted that new styles or strategies of action are established, of which rhetorical justification would be an empirical example. In contrast, the 'settled lives' of the department before the arrival of Alex, did not contain clashes of perspective since it was dominated by the 'sporting' perspective, nor were there competing models for organising experience (in the department at least), since 'traditions' and 'common sense' prevailed in this taken for granted world. In such settled lives the culture may be taken to constrain action by providing a limited set of resources out of which individuals and groups construct their strategies of action.

The movement into an unsettled period with the arrival of Alex, provided the conditions for an expansion of the cultural abilities of his staff, enabling them to learn, construct, and develop a modified form of action in relation to the structural opportunities that became available in the school. As such, the reactions of the department and the emergence of a greater awareness and ability to utilise micropolitical strategies, indicates how at certain historical junctures new cultural complexes make possible new or reorganised strategies of action. Since it appears that culture acts
differently in 'settled' as opposed to 'unsettled' periods of social life in schools, a critical task for future research will be to focus specifically on how the cultural capacities created in one historical context are reappropriated and altered in new circumstances. Such an endeavour would possibly assist in providing micro-macro linkages within social theory\2^3, enabling levels of analysis dealing with the structural conditions of society to coexist and be informed by micro forms of analysis which would illuminate the evolution and development of these cultural capacities as they are tested out by the individual in the paramount reality of the working world of the school.

(17.5) ESSENTIALLY MICRO-MESO: A RATIONALE FOR THE OMISSION OF A MACRO ANALYSIS OF BRANSTOWN SCHOOL.

The Branstown Study began with definite micro intentions in order to provide a balance in the literature which was (and still is) deficient in this form of investigation into the world of physical educators. The aim was to understand how a specific group of teachers made sense of an innovation which was instigated by their own head of department, and as such was concerned to provide a description and analysis (not an evaluation) of the interaction of the multiple realities involved. The active agencies of other subject areas and pupils have been ignored to a large extent, and have been of interest only in so far as they have been granted significance by the physical educators in relation to innovation\2^4, as part of the institutional bias of the school. Hence, institutional factors within
Branstown School, such as, the curriculum review and the perceived views of the Headmaster, rather than the wider structural constraints of society, has provided the context for understanding the actions of the physical educators in relation to change, although the theoretical interpretations of the researcher have been influenced by an awareness of happenings beyond the school gate.

The institutional organisational influences focused upon in the study are those recognised by the teachers involved as shaping their actions, and their influence can be detected reasonably directly in the motives and intentions of the teachers. Within Branstown School the physical educators were aware of their own low status, they were aware of their attempts to improve status, and they were aware of the political manoeuvrings along with the conflicts which accompanied the proposals for innovation. As such it is hoped that this study is not too guilty (although it probably is) of the failings of many school based studies in the sociology of education, which according to Young and Whitty (1977) from their marxist perspective, "seem to present education as being carried out in a social vacuum" (p7), and in terms of coping strategies Andy Hargreaves (1978b) has claimed that the micro orientation has failed to appreciate the factors which provides the structural context in which action at other levels occurs. However, as David Hargreaves (1978) forcibly notes, many macro orientated marxist theorists of 'the system' appear to have little contact with the 'real' world at all, indulging in polemic pieces where theoretical kudos is achieved without soiling one's hands with field research,
and Pollard (1982) has noted that Andy Hargreaves's (1978a) model of coping strategies is 'thin' at the micro level of school action causing it to be phenomenologically and interactionally limited. Similarly, Rock (1979) outlines how interactionism has tended to disregard most macro-sociological thought as an unsure and over-ambitious metaphysics, with the realms described by macro sociology as not open to intelligent examination. This macro versus micro conflict has, however, had no part in the Branstown Study since it is seen as a fruitless approach to advancing our understanding of the social world, and both levels of analysis are taken to provide valuable insights into how society shapes and is in turn shaped by the schooling system.

The central concern, however, has been with the intentions of actors and not the outcomes of actions, for example, classroom control became a concern to the innovation in terms of what it meant to the teacher and not to its observable effects in the classroom. This in itself orientates the study away from a macro analysis in terms of the function control serves for the maintenance of the status quo in society, as would have been in order from a conservative 'functionalist' perspective\textsuperscript{26}, or a radical 'marxian' perspective\textsuperscript{27}, where an assumed 'correspondence' between the 'needs' of society and the 'nature' of schools would be used to locate a teacher initiated innovation, particularly in relation to its effects on pupils. Such broader issues are not confronted in the Branstown Study, making it inappropriate (in its present form) for offering a political critique as to the nature and desirability of change in schools, although it
is recognised that the teachers involved may well be products of the dominant capitalist ideology, striving to cope with the dialectical tensions and inconsistencies in their place of work. That there may also be links between the activities in school and the wider social structure is also recognised, even though an intentional link seems difficult to establish, and it would seem sensible that where possible small-scale ethnographic accounts of a particular aspect of school life should be placed in a larger context that takes account of the structural processes that move the school and its participants one way and not another.

This does not, however, remove the problem of just how far this process of situating should go. Should the internal processes of the school be placed in the context of the local community, the demands and pressures of the local education authority, changes in the local economy and so on? Should these local patterns then be related to changes at the national level, to the nature of class struggle, the requirements of an economic mode of production, the nature and demands of the capitalist (or socialist) state and the extent of its dependence on and independence from the capitalist economy? One need not even stop here, since states, economies and politics are not insulated systems, but part of a vast and complexly interconnected global pattern, hence the subject subculture of physical education should perhaps not just be related to the local and national context, but to the whole social totality, that is to the entire world system.
This form of accounting can be included, but since it tends to involve a lengthy retrospective analysis it remains difficult to cover in a single study. In relation to this it is interesting to note that with regards to teacher initiated innovation Kirk (1986c) has shifted his perspective from his original micro orientation in 1984(a), when he was engaged in field research, to a more macro critical theory form of analysis of his earlier ethnographic study. However, whilst one might agree with Harris (1982) that there should be a rigorous dialogue between theory and evidence, a dialogue which involves adjudicating between competing theories as well as modifying existing ones, this highly desirable stance must be reserved for an ideal world where researchers have unlimited resources of time, money, and energy. In practice the choice between one seemingly arbitrary set of concepts and categories and another, is often made on pragmatic grounds. For the lone researcher at Branstown School this was particularly so, as he was unemployed, taking on 'cash-in-hand' jobs where possible to sponsor his research and provide the basics of life such as food, heating, and paying rent, which certainly influenced many of his decisions involved with the research. This is not of course to deny that the researcher does not have personal preferences for certain forms of research and these assumptions have been made clear in Chapter 3. The research dilemma is then a question of how much can be done with the available time and resources in the course of one study?. Andy Hargreaves (1985) encapsulates this constant research dilemma in his following statement;
"Nor, given the shortness of our lives and the finite nature of human effort, would it be feasible, even if such data were available, to show the extent to which and the ways in which schools in all known societies produced patterns of reproduction and/or resistance to the social, political, and economic orders in which they are located. And again from a practical perspective, there are clear limits to just how many concepts can be rigorously interrogated for their validity in any particular study, just as there are to the exhaustiveness of that interrogation........For a host of practical reasons then, some things must be left out. Neither the world system, nor the smallest interactional encounter can be described in their entire complexity, nor is it obvious that they should be. Life, as they say, is simply too short." (Hargreaves,A.1985,p34)

Therefore, based on theoretical interests and pragmatic concerns the Branstown Study placed an emphasis upon what-coping-with-innovation-means-to-teachers, as opposed to what-is-it-that-has-to-be-coped-with. However, the consideration of institutional influences within the school in terms of institutional bias and the micropolitics of innovation, may be considered an extension into the second level of contextualisation as outlined by Pollard(1982) in his revised model of coping strategies, and makes explicit a concern for the meso level of analysis. This and future considerations of school life at the meso level would provide the potential link between the world of small scale face-to-face interaction, on the one hand, and vast social structures of immense proportions on the other. Bridging this gap would require additional support from what Merton(1968) has classified as theories of the middle range. These theories, he argues;

"Lie in between the minor but necessary working hypotheses that evolve in abundance during day to day research and the all-inclusive systematic efforts to develop a unified theory that will explain all the observed uniformities of social behaviour, social organization and social change......Middle range theory is......intermediate to general theories of social systems which
are too remote from particular classes of social behaviour, organization and change to account for what is observed and to those detailed orderly descriptions of particulars that are not generalized at all. Middle range theory involves abstractions, of course, but they are close enough to observed data to be incorporated in propositions that permit empirical testing." (Merton, 1968, p.39)

Hence, between the happenings of the classroom and the structural constraints of a capitalist society, lies a whole range of intermediary processes which have tended to be neglected within the sociology of education, such as, institutional bias and school ethos33, teacher cultures34, and importantly teacher coping strategies in relation to the micropolitics of the school and department35. In terms of curriculum innovation these areas are in desperate need of investigation, and Ball (1985) has clearly indicated that educational change (or lack of it) as represented in forms of school organisation and the learning experiences of children is, "fundamentally related to institutional micropolitics" (p.57), and suggests that the micropolitical matrix of the institution needs to be recognised as a powerful mediator when change is proposed, either from within or without.

As such there is a need for a future research emphasis on the meso level, that is, an analysis of the group and the school as a social organisation, and such movement into the meso level was forced upon the researcher in the Branstown Study since only by a consideration at this level could appropriate interpretations be made of the actions and intentions of the individual teachers, in relation to the department and the rest of the school. By paying more attention in
future to the school as a social organisation, and filling out this meso level, it is hoped to prevent the tendency (and need) for certain more macro orientated researchers, such as, Anyon(1981) and Sharp and Green(1975), to leap from highly localised observations of teacher-pupil interaction in a small number of classrooms to speculative assertions which "seek the grandeur of global theories", about how these processes are determined by the class struggle and other forces within capitalism.

The findings from the Branstown Study will be developed in the future by focusing upon curriculum innovations such as health related fitness and T.V.E.I. in physical education, and hopefully may be extended to include innovations in other low status subjects, such as, craft and design or home economics, as part of the method of 'continuous comparison' described by Hoyle(1986b), in which insights gained from one study are pursued in other schools in different contexts in order to develop and test a substantive theory of coping with innovation, whereby the working hypothesis would suggest that a strategic rhetoric will be developed by such low status subjects with regards to any innovation, which may deflect any change in actual practice.

These future studies will be directed predominantly towards those areas that Hammersley(1980) has classified as micro-substantive, and which would include considerations of the meso level and such matters as the differentiation and polarisation of pupils, the development of coping strategies for innovations, and the
micropolitics of change in schools. This would mean that whilst this work will be focused predominantly at one level, it will remain sensitive to work in other traditions pitched at other levels.

Unfortunately, just as with the Branstown Study it is expected that the researcher will have to learn to live with failure, since it will always remain impossible to do justice to the richness and complexity of the lived in world of 'ordinary' people. Such failure whilst ego-deflating, is central to many forms of social research, and has to be lived with as the quest for greater understanding of the social world continues.

17.6 Notes and Audit Trail for Chapter Seventeen.

1. See Denscombe (1980) for a more detailed discussion of competent membership.
2. Berger and Luckmann (1966), Blumer (1966), and Mead (1934).
5. See Stryker and Serpe (1982).
7. See Pollard (1982).
8. During the course of the study five out of the seven in the department gained promotion.
14. I would like to thank Dr. Peter Stromberg for directing my reading in this area, and allowing me to read initial drafts of several chapters from his forthcoming book.
15. For a detailed account of reference groups see Shibutani (1955).
17. Parsons (1951) defines value as, "an element of a shared symbolic system which serves as a criterion or standard for selection among alternatives of orientation which are intrinsically open in a situation" (p12).
18. Bourdieu's (1977) notion of 'habitus' is similar to this view of culture. He defines habitus as, "a system of lasting transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions,
appreciations, and action and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks, thanks to analogical transfers of schemes permitting the solution of similarly shaped problems" (p82-83).

19. See Chapter 1 on mechanistic conceptions of man, and Garfinkel (1967) who implies man as 'cultural dope'.


21. Stromberg (1985) uses the term 'ideology' for what has been categorised as 'perspectives' in the Branstown Study.

22. Stromberg (1985) suggests a continuum from ideology, to tradition, to common sense.

23. David Hargreaves (1980) suggests that 'culture' is the joining point between the macro and micro levels.

24. This of course is not to deny their critical importance in the process of schooling.

25. For example, in making sense of the physical educators' status concerns I drew upon an awareness of the status concerns of teachers as an occupational group in society, of the subculture of physical education within the educational system, and finally the concerns of those in the department at Branstown School.

26. For example, Durkheim (1956), and Turner (1971).

27. For example, Althusser (1971), Bourdieu (1977), Bowles and Gintis (1977), and Young (1971, 1976).


30. See Apple (1979, 1982), Harris (1982), Pollard (1984), and Sharp (1980).


32. Wallerstein (1974) implies that this would be the logical conclusion.


34. David Hargreaves (1980, 1982).


36. See Merton (1968), page 139.

37. These were suggested as likely targets for study in the future by Professor Hoyle (1986) in a personal communication.

38. This has been described previously by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as the 'constant comparison method'.

39. The other areas he defines are; micro-formal (for example, the rules of conversation), macro-formal (for example, the division of labour), and macro-substantive (for example, the history of physical education in England). See also Hammersley (1984b).
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